The Biblical Seminary [redacted]
LIBRARY
[redacted] RR 86
G 255
TO BE CHARGED IF TAKEN FROM THE ROOM

BS
680
.S2
G39
1953

BIBLICAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
200 NORTH MAIN STREET
HATFIELD, PENNSYLVANIA 19440-2499

SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD

BIBLICAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
200 NORTH MAIN STREET
HATFIELD, PENNSYLVANIA 19440-2499

G811

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/sacrificepriesth0000scga_i3d8

SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN

BY

S. C. GAYFORD

FORMERLY VICE-PRINCIPAL OF WILBERFORCE COLLEGE, CUDDESDON, AND BISHOPS' COLLEGE, CHESHUNT.

WITH A NEW PREFACE BY
THE RT. REV. F. D. V. NARBOROUGH,
BISHOP OF COLCHESTER

METHUEN & CO. LTD., LONDON

36 Essex Street, Strand, W.C.2

BIBLICAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
200 NORTH MAIN STREET
HATFIELD, PENNSYLVANIA 19440-2499

BS11

First Published July 17th, 1924
Second Edition, 1953

2.I
CATALOGUE NO. 5682/U

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

TO MY BROTHERS

THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS

AT CUDDESDON AND CHESHUNT

1899–1914

FOREWORD

FROM the days of E. F. Willis at Cuddesdon (he was Vice-Principal, 1870–1880, and afterwards Founder of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta) it became an almost sacrosanct tradition of the College that the Old Testament Lectures should give especial attention to the Sacrifices of the Old Covenant. To that tradition I acknowledge a great debt of gratitude. It launched me on a voyage of discovery which has been for many years an unfailing source of profit and delight. Why should the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, a subject second to none in importance and interest, find so inadequate a place in the ordinary University Theological curriculum?

Of the many friends and colleagues to whom I have been indebted for help of various kinds, there are three especially I should like to mention by name: Canon F. C. N. Hicks, Canon Du Buisson, and the Reverend Leslie Owen, who have given invaluable assistance in seeing the book through the Press.

S. C. GAYFORD

THE LICKEY
April 1924

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE republication of this book I believe to be an event of considerable importance in the course of theological development. Its inaccessibility to students through being out of print has been a regrettable handicap.

Nothing that has happened since its first publication in 1924 is likely to be found to have invalidated its thesis. A great deal of the Biblical study of that day carried criticism to irrational and almost morbid extremes of suspicion, aspersion and scepticism, against which neo-fundamentalism has been a natural reaction. Gayford was one of the few to make constructive use of the results of historical research and analysis. His book shows the power of a sane Higher Criticism to bring about an increase of spiritual insight.

He expounds a loftier conception of the theology of the Old Testament sacrifices than those to which we have been accustomed. His own arguments in its favour receive reinforcement when we remember the use of the Psalms in the Jewish Temple, providing, as they did, a deeply spiritual accompaniment to the rather strange proceedings of the ceremonial. The whole argument is gathered up into a doctrine

of the Eucharist rich enough to make us exclaim at the manifold wisdom of God.

The lectures out of which this book originated were delivered by Gayford at Cuddesdon and at Bishops' College, Cheshunt. The present Principal of Cheshunt, Canon Lindsay Dewar, has interested himself in the reprinting of this book. As a Cuddesdon man convinced of its value, I welcome the opportunity of reintroducing it.

DUDLEY COLCHESTER

DERBY HOUSE,
COLCHESTER.
July, 1953.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

PREFACE BY THE RT. REV. F. D. V. NARBOROUGH, BISHOP OF COLCHESTER

INTRODUCTION 1
The Sacrifices and Biblical Inspiration—The Prophets and the Sacrifices.

PART I

THE JEWISH SACRIFICES

I. GENERAL: JEWISH IDEAS OF SACRIFICE . 9
Our business with Sacrifice as a working system in the time of Our Lord—Underlying ideas.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF THE SACRIFICES . . 23
Sacrifice (*zebaḥ*) and Offering (*minḥah*)—Different kinds of animal Sacrifices—Bases of division: degree of atonement, order of origin, spiritual sequence—Limitations of purpose.

III. THE CEREMONIAL ACTS OF SACRIFICE . 59
Presentation—Laying on of hands—Slaughtering—Meaning and use of the blood—Disposal of the carcass.

IV. THE DAY OF ATONEMENT . . . 83
Date of origin—Its purpose—Its ceremonial—The "sprinkling" of the blood—The mercy seat—The scapegoat.

V. THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT UNDERLYING THE SACRIFICES 100
Meaning of *kipper*—The *poena vicaria* theory—The facts to be taken into consideration—Conclusions from them—The death and the offering of the blood—The ideas of "cleansing," "consecrating," and "atonement"—Death essential but not central—The element of vicariousness.

PART II

THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW COVENANT

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. COMPARISON OF SACRIFICE UNDER THE OLD AND THE NEW COVENANT . . . 123
Their continuity—"Fulfilment" of the old—Differences: imperfections of the old.

VII. THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE: CHRIST AND THE CHURCH 130
The unity between the Son of man and all mankind—"In Christ"—His Offering and ours—These together make up the fullness of the Christian Sacrifice.

VIII. THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE: (A) AS FULFILLED IN JESUS CHRIST . . . 136
The perfect Sacrifice: meaning and implications—Sacrificer, victim, Priest—The acts of His Sacrifice: (i) His incarnate life. (ii) His death: its relation to the life; its distinctness in regard to the atonement. (iii) The Resurrection: blood means "risen life." (iv) The Ascension: His Priesthood and Priestly work: its scene, the Heavenly Temple: the perpetual Offering: Meaning of "the One Offering"—The Epistle to the Hebrews—"Sacrifice and Offering."

IX. THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE: (B) AS FULFILLED IN THE CHURCH'S LIFE AND WORSHIP 158
Sacrifice in daily life—Its expression in worship—The Eucharist linked with sacrifice—Its relation to (i) the death of Christ, (ii) the Heavenly Offering.

INDEX 177

INTRODUCTION

THIS book is the outcome of a course of lectures delivered to several generations of students in the Theological Colleges at Cuddesdon and Cheshunt, and now published in book form at their kind request. Its ultimate purpose is religious and practical. I hope and believe it may serve as an eirenicon between the Catholic and Evangelical schools of thought not only within the Anglican Communion but also in other Christian bodies. That God may so bless it, is my earnest prayer. But at the same time it represents an attempt at research in its subject on scientific lines. For anyone educated as a Christian, however slight the Christian training, to approach such a subject with a blank mind is of course an impossibility. I have tried throughout to treat impartially the evidence supplied by the Jewish sacrificial system, to be guided only whither it led, and to follow through into Christianity the lines laid down in the Jewish preparation. The main results do not claim to be original. Theologians who differ widely in other respects have agreed in maintaining that Sacrifice consists not merely in killing something, but in the offering of a life that has passed through death, i.e. a *risen* life. What I have tried to do is to justify this conception of Sacrifice by a detailed study of the Jewish Sacrifices and the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ (chiefly as treated in the Epistle to the

Hebrews), and then to show that it leads to a view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which includes all that a faithful Catholic would demand as *essential*, and at the same time nothing which the Evangelical is bound by his principles to reject.

In this as in many other cases a great deal might be done in the way of reconciliation by a more exact definition of terms. Needless controversy is created by using words in different senses. I cannot help thinking that this has been the case with the much-abused word "Sacrifice" itself. This word to many people is, rightly or wrongly, so closely associated with the *death* of a victim that it is doubtful if we shall ever be able to widen its connotation so as to include the thought of offering life rather than death.[1] The New Testament, and especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, gives some support to the popular use of the term. Following this usage we should need two words, "Sacrifice" and "Offering" to cover the complete idea of Sacrifice: the former referring especially to the death, and the latter to the presenting of the blood. We should have to guard in that case against any attempt to separate the two, or to treat them as anything else than inseparable parts of one indivisible whole: "Sacrifice" and "Offering" together making up the act of worship properly called "Sacrifice." In any case, it would be a great step in the direction of peace if we could agree to speak of the "Eucharistic *Offering*" rather than the "Eucharistic *Sacrifice*."

There are certain preliminary questions we may

[1] See further, p. 24.

anticipate in some degree in our Introduction. Every student of the Jewish Sacrifices is bound to face the questions: Are there spiritual ideas behind the ceremonial acts of the Sacrifices? If so, are they such ideas as can be accepted by the Christian teaching? To both questions we shall answer "Yes."[1] It is admitted by all that the ceremonial acts had a spiritual significance; so much is implied by the interpretation of one of them in Lev. xvii. 11. Whether the ideas which they symbolize are consistent with Christianity we shall have to judge when we see what they are. But the acknowledgment of their permanent religious value leads to a further question: How far was the Jewish Church conscious of the truths embodied in its Sacrifices? Is it enough for us to show that to those who have first learnt them from Christian teachers these truths are recognizable as the underlying meaning of the old ceremonies? No doubt in part the symbolism was perceived by the choicer spirits among the Jews; so much we can gather from the glimpses they give us now and then, e.g. in Pss. xl., l., and li. But we can see in the Sacrifices more than was ever dreamt of by the wisest among them; and that without any fanciful or arbitrary allegorizing, but simply by the light of a higher revelation. The Sacrifices were pregnant with deeper truth than anyone realized before a new light was thrown on them by the Death and Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord. The more this becomes clear to us the more we realize the claim of the Law to Inspiration. It bids us correct a modern tendency

[1] See Sanday and Headlam, "Romans," p. 92.

almost to confine to the Prophets the title to Inspiration, while the Law is treated as an alien intruder in the sacred writings. With its spiritual value reinstated and vindicated, the Law must be restored to its rightful place among the inspired writings. The very acknowledgment of its *latent* Christianity is a strong argument for its Inspiration. It proves that the Jewish law-makers were moved and guided, like the Prophets, by an inspiring power which implanted in their teaching seeds of deeper truth than they themselves were aware of: seeds, the fruit of which only came to the light of day at a later time. In proportion as our interpretation of the sacrificial ceremonial is natural and unstrained, and its results yield truths of real and abiding worth when valued by the Christian standard, the argument for Inspiration becomes more cogent. Restoring the Sacrifices of the Old Covenant to the full honour which is their rightful due, we are able at the same time to restore to the Christian Apologetic a valuable weapon which it has been in danger of losing.

In the last few sentences we have already anticipated another possible objection. It has been questioned whether the religion of the Jewish Prophets allowed any room for the Sacrifices as a genuine element in the revelation of Jehovah to His people. It is suggested that we should be nearer the mark in regarding the Sacrifices as a heathen intrusion and survival, which the Prophets at the most barely tolerated and sometimes openly repudiated. For some years it has been the fashion to speak of the Old Testament as if it contained two antagonistic religions

—the Priestly and the Prophetic—one of which had necessarily to make way for the other in preparing the way for Christianity.[1] It is easy, indeed, to make a selection of passages which, if they stood alone in the prophetical utterances, might be interpreted in some such sense, e.g. 1 Sam. xv. 22 ; Amos v. 21–25 ; Hosea vi. 6 ; Mic. vi. 6–8 ; Is. i. 11 ; Jer. vi. 20, vii. 21, 22 ; Pss. xl. 6, l. 8, li. 16. But these passages must be balanced by other words and actions of the Prophets. It must be recognized that the Sacrifices formed a regular part of the personal and public religion of Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 9, 17, ix. 12, x. 8, xvi. 2) ; that Isaiah received his call in the Temple, and the very object of the Temple's existence was before all else the offering of Sacrifices ; that even in Amos there are signs that he considered the laws relating to Sacrifices as binding on the people.[2] A still higher estimate of the Temple is seen in Is. ii. 2–4 ; Micah iv. 1–3 ; and with it we may compare Jer. xvii. 26, xxxi. 14. The last references reveal to us that the Prophets, even in their picture of an ideal restored people and worship, include the Temple and its Sacrifices as permanent features of the higher religion of the future. We have to remember that two at least of the Prophets—Jeremiah and Ezekiel—were also Priests, and that any sense of antagonism between Priest and Prophet of the earlier days disappeared entirely after the Exile. Very probably the

[1] See e.g. W. Robertson Smith, "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," pp. 293–295 ; G. A. Smith, "Book of the Twelve," vol. I, pp. 102–104 ; and more guardedly Westphal, "The Law and the Prophets" (E.T.), pp. 320–328.

[2] Kirkpatrick, "Doctrine of the Prophets," p. 105.

Sacrifices had their roots in primitive heathenism. The Christian Fathers recognized this long before the modern study of Comparative Religion made it familiar to us.[1] But without doubt the Prophets accepted them as being sanctioned by the God of Israel, and incorporated into His worship. What they condemned was either Sacrifice which was a mockery because it was divorced from religion or morality, or Sacrifice regarded as a mere piece of mechanical ceremonial, i.e. in both cases the survival of heathen ideas in the popular conception of Sacrifice. Perhaps in Oriental fashion they seem sometimes to hold one idea in their heads to the exclusion of its counterbalancing truth (as, for instance, St. Paul seems to do with the two truths of Divine Omnipotence and human responsibility), and to speak as if denouncing Sacrifice *in toto*. But "it is inconceivable that they should wage any war against Sacrifice in itself."[2]

The teaching of the Prophets contains little in the way of direct interpretation of the Sacrifices and their ceremonial. Occasionally, however, as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 24, we see that they got at the heart of the matter, and saw in Sacrifice an expression of religious truth. Isaiah liii. brings the Sacrifices into the direct line of witness to the Messiah. But it is the attitude of our Lord Himself which gives the final sanction to the view that the Sacrifices were meant to have an honoured place in the Divine Revelation. Many instances will occur to every one of the way He obeyed and enjoined on others the fulfilment of the

[1] See Chrysostom, "Homily on St. Matthew," vi, 3.
[2] A. B. Davidson, "Old Testament Prophecy," p. 427.

Sacrificial Laws. We need mention only the most significant of them. At the Last Supper He spoke of His coming death as a Sacrifice, the "Blood" of which was to inaugurate the "New Covenant." In fulfilling the word of the Prophet Jeremiah (xxxi. 31), the Founder of the New Covenant vouches for a true continuity between the Jewish Sacrifices and His own. He adopts the sacrificial language of the Old Covenant and applies it with all its associations to the New. The Old Covenant was dedicated with the blood of victims slain as Burnt Offerings and Peace Offerings (Ex. xxiv. 5–8); the New Covenant is dedicated "with the Blood of Christ, Who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish unto God" (Heb. ix. 14). After this it is unnecessary to labour further the point that the Jewish Law of Sacrifice was not merely a tolerated survival or a heathen intrusion in the religious development through Judaism to Christianity, but a genuine part of the main stream of that development in its course to the Ocean of Grace and Truth.

SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD

PART I

THE JEWISH SACRIFICES

CHAPTER I

SACRIFICE IN GENERAL AND THE JEWISH IDEAS OF SACRIFICE

THE purpose of these lectures leaves a good deal of the subject of Sacrifice in general outside their scope. We are engaged in the study of the subject as a point of practical Christian religion. We do not need to trace the idea of Sacrifice back to its origins or to follow its various expressions in different religions. We are not directly concerned even with its origin or development in the religion of the Old Testament. It is with the stage at which the Jewish Sacrificial system stood at the birth of Christianity, with the Sacrifices as the Author of Christianity found them, and used them as the basis of His own religion, that we really have to do. And that means the fully developed system of Sacrifice as seen in the Priestly Code of Law—the Levitical Law.

It has often been stated that this Levitical Law of Sacrifice was never actually carried out, but remained as an unrealized ideal—a piece of paper legislation. But at the most this cannot mean more than that the system was never completely carried out to the letter in all its details. That the Priesthood and the faithful among the people at the opening of the Christian Era *did aim* at fulfilling scrupulously the Law of Sacrifice is indisputable; further, that they imagined themselves to have succeeded in doing so; and finally that the law in question was the *Levitical* Law. How far the nation as a whole succeeded in carrying out the Priestly Code in all its details is a question to which we have hardly sufficient evidence to give an answer with any certainty. But so far as the Sacrifices are concerned we have good reason to suppose that the law was observed substantially as it stands in the Priestly Code. At any rate, this much is certain: that the points of ceremonial which are of importance in the relation of the Old Covenant to the New were familiar features of the Jewish worship and formed a living part of their religion. There is a world of difference in this respect between Ezekiel's vision of the restored Temple-worship and the regulations of the Priestly Code. The one admittedly was never more than an ideal; the latter for many centuries actually entered into the religious life of the people, and formed a part of their training in preparation for the Gospel. Zacharias, Elizabeth, Simeon, Anna, Joseph, and Mary,[1] the first of their nation to whom the Gospel came, are all found diligent in attendance

[1] See St. Luke i. 5-23, ii. 22-42.

at the Temple worship. In the language of the strongly Jewish document on which St. Luke bases his account of the Nativity, they were "righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless"; and these words from such a source cover the ceremonial as well as the moral law. We have good ground then for taking the Levitical regulations as the working standard of Sacrifice at the time of the birth of Christ. This Levitical Code embraced, and as far as possible harmonized, the earlier legislation found in the Pentateuch. The current ceremonial of the Temple also included certain partially independent features derived from the "Oral Tradition." But these were not very numerous or very significant. They were mostly explanations or amplifications of the Levitical Code.

In enquiring into the significance of many of the ceremonial and other details we shall necessarily be led at times into the history of their origin and development. It is only so that we can keep along the lines of a sound method. But it is occasional excursions into the history of some particular detail or the meaning of some significant word that we shall be called to make rather than a systematic exposition of the whole history of the Jewish Sacrifices. This preliminary defining of boundaries will perhaps anticipate and prevent the criticism of those who otherwise might be disappointed at missing a fuller treatment of this part of the subject. The archæology of the Jewish sacrificial system concerns us only in so far as it throws light on the meaning of this or that feature. *A fortiori* is this the case with the more

primitive heathen religions. Sacrifice, we are told, is as universal as prayer in the primitive religions.[1] It is absent from some of the more advanced religions, which have outgrown the primitive and semi-barbarous ceremonies, but in them also the spirit which prompted the earliest forms of Sacrifice is present, only it has found a more refined and perhaps a more spiritual form of expression.[2] This is the case with Christianity too, but the Christian religion is fortunate in having retained much of the terminology of the earlier worship as a witness to its continuity with the past. Other religions, such as Buddhism or Confucianism, have dropped the older terminology and given themselves thereby a more revolutionary aspect. In some cases they represented, perhaps, such a leap forward in spiritual idea that their real continuity with the past has escaped notice, and they are credited with being spontaneous and original discoveries on the part of their founders. But they do not really form exceptions to the general truth that religion in all its forms has for one of its foundation stones the idea or ideas implied in the offering of Sacrifice.

What, then, are we to understand by the underlying idea or ideas of Sacrifice? Running right through its history from its first appearances to its latest development in Christianity two ideas are found to remain constant. The first is the Gift idea. Sacrifice is a means by which man offers to God a gift. The motive of the gift may be gratitude or desire for a reward, or fear, or penitence. The other idea—generally called

[1] Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," p. 214; Jevons, "Comparative Religion" (1913), pp. 21, 22.

[2] Jevons, "Comparative Religion," pp. 142, 143.

the Communion idea—is not so easy to grasp. In its earliest form it rests on the belief that by sharing with their god in a common meal on the sacred flesh and blood of the totem animal the sacrificers were brought into communion with him. This was more clearly the case when the victim, the totem animal, was itself identified with the god. The sacrificial feast was then nothing less than an actual feeding upon the god and receiving his life into themselves. It was more than communion: it was union.

Of these two purposes of Sacrifice, the Gift and the Communion, it is a disputed point which is the more primitive. It is urged on the one hand that before the idea of property arose the Gift idea could not exist, and therefore the Communion idea is the older. But it has been pointed out, on the other hand, that the earliest Sacrifices would not be offered by individuals or even by families. They would be corporate actions of the entire community, the clan, or the tribe. And though the notion of separate individual or family property may be comparatively late, communal property is as old as community life. There is no objection, then, to the primitive character of the Gift idea if the primitive Sacrifices were tribal acts, as it is generally agreed they were. The question is, however, one which for our present purpose we may leave to the anthropologists to decide.[1]

[1] The Gift theory—the older of the two—is represented by Tylor, "Primitive Culture," Lecture XVIII (3rd ed., 1891) and Herbert Spencer, "Principles of Sociology," § 139 (1893). The Communion theory seems to have been first suggested by Sykes, "Nature of Sacrifices," pp. 59-80 (1748); but the evidence in its favour was set out fully for the first time by Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," Lecture VIII (2nd ed., 1894). See also Jevons, "Introduction to the History of Religion," Chaps. XI, XII (1896), "Comparative Religion," Chap. II (1913); Frazer, "Golden Bough" (1890), Chap. III.

Whether both ideas are equally primitive, or one of them is original and the other later, the fact remains that throughout the historical period of Hebrew religion, from first to last, the Gift idea is by far the more prominent of the two. The common meal, indeed, was always the chief feature in the ceremonial of the Peace Offering, and always signified a fellowship between the offerer and his God. But it would be fair to say that the idea of fellowship between the offerer and his invited guests came to be more prominent than that of communion with God.[1] And every trace of the prehistoric "eating the god" has disappeared from the Old Testament. Grace, in the

[1] The idea of communion with God as being effected by Sacrifice is probably more clearly seen in the *Covenant-making* Sacrifices than in the Peace Offering. In these the blood of the victim is shared between the altar (on which it is "poured" or "put"), as representing God, and those with whom the Covenant is made. So at the inauguration of the Old Covenant (Ex. xxiv. 6–8) the blood was "poured" (not "sprinkled" as in the Revised Version) on altar and people. Similarly at the cleansing of a healed leper (Lev. xiv. 14) and at the consecration of a Priest (Ex. xxix. 20; Lev. viii. 23) the blood was applied to the person concerned as well as to the altar. In each case, moreover, the touch of the blood imparts to him the property of "holiness." By the original Covenant Sacrifice (Ex. xxiv.) Israel, sharing with God in the same life-blood, is made a "holy" people: the touch of the blood both "cleanses" the people from the uncleanness of its previous contact with the "profane" world and also "consecrates" them, sets them apart, as "holy to the Lord." In the case of the leper the blood restored him to the "holiness" from which the "uncleanness" of his disease had excommunicated him. In the case of the Priest the blood gave him a still closer union with the Deity—an intensified "holiness." Perhaps in these instances we may trace a survival from the primitive Sacrifices in which the offerer eating the flesh and drinking the blood of his god became united with him. When blood became forbidden as food its virtues were imparted to men by the contact of touch. It would be of deep interest to know how much of this train of thought is latent in the discourse of St. John vi. (especially 53–56). Undoubtedly some of it survives in the Epistle to the Hebrews (see especially ix. 13, x. 22, xii. 24) and possibly in Revelation i. 5 (if λούσαντι is to be read), vii. 14; 1 Peter i. 2, 19.

sense of Divine help to the soul, was not looked for in the Peace Offering, or indeed in any of the Sacrifices of the Old Covenant.[1] Throughout the Old Testament the offering of a gift in the Sacrifices completely overshadows the idea of seeking communion with God. There are, perhaps, indications of a time when the Peace Offering was the only form of Sacrifice ; [2] but, as far as the actual evidence takes us back in the Old Testament, the Burnt Offering always appears side by side with the Peace Offering. And the whole aim and object of the Burnt Offering was the offering of a gift to God. No part of the victim was left either for Priest or for offerer : the whole was surrendered to God. Several other facts show how prominent in the historical period was the idea of the gift. In pre-exilic times the generic name for the thing offered in all Sacrifices was *minhah* (= a tributary gift). After the Exile this word was confined to the offering of the fruits of the field, but the general word for Offering, the familiar *corban* (*qorban*), also meant a gift or present. The ordinary term for offering a Sacrifice (*hiqrib*, from the same root as *corban*) means "to present" (*lit.* "to bring near"). These facts show how strongly the Jews associated the idea of the gift with their Sacrifices, and how completely the idea of communion had retired into the background. But at the same time it was never, perhaps, quite forgotten. It remained, as it were, in suspense until Christianity took it up and brought it to the front again in the Christian Sacrifice. Must we not recognize in this fact one of the many proofs of an overruling Providence

[1] See p. 55. [2] See p. 32.

guiding the unconscious driftings of the Jewish mind ? All was working towards its predestined fulfilment in the Gospel. And at the same time have we not here, too, an indication that the Jewish Sacrifices were intended by the Holy Spirit to play a leading part among the forerunners of the Messiah ?

Returning to the Gift idea in the Sacrifices, we see further that the Jews came to realize not only the rightfulness of giving in the abstract, but also the peculiar kind of gift that was most acceptable with God. At an early stage the truth was grasped that animal life being of a higher order than plant life the gift of an animal was of more value than the fruits of the field. Abel's offering of the " firstlings of his flock and the fat thereof " was outwardly as well as inwardly better than Cain's gift of the " fruit of the ground." With a true sense of ceremonial fitness the outward was made a proper counterpart to the inward superiority. Corresponding with this, too, is the regulation by which the blood (" which is the life "—the animal life) was not shared by man with God, as in the heathen Semitic Sacrifices ; the " life " of the living thing was given to God exclusively. Nor is it arbitrary to trace the same line of thought a stage further. It is true that human Sacrifice is alien to the Old Testament religion, but at the same time the chosen people are reminded of a deeper principle underlying it. Abraham is prevented from the slaughter of Isaac, but he is shown that the offering of a son reveals a greater Sacrifice than the offering of an animal. It is not only that human life is of a higher order than animal life (some inkling of this is to be seen in the sacrificial slaughter

of prisoners of war common in Semitic heathenism); but this sacrifice required a surrender of the life that is nearest and dearest to a father's heart—the first-born son, the only son; it is not merely or principally the value of the gift in itself, but the *cost* of the gift to the giver, that comes into view. He is not asked to offer something which, however intrinsically precious, touches himself in a secondary degree: it is almost, if not more than, his own life which is demanded of him. In other words, the greatest of all Sacrifices is a self-sacrifice. And though the allusions to human Sacrifice in the Old Testament show that it could never have a place in the revealed religion of Israel, the Israelites were reminded that their nearest and dearest belonged of right to God if He chose to claim His due (Exod. xxii. 29). The first-born son has to be "redeemed" in acknowledgment that he is owed to the Lord and that the claim of God, though waived, is not surrendered (Num. xviii. 15, 17). And once more the Christian fulfilment unexpectedly takes us back to the crude original starting-point in its literal form. God Himself on our behalf gives His Only Begotten Son in human flesh to the horrors of a violent form of physical death. And yet that literal form—the horror and savagery of death by crucifixion—is transfigured into a thing of glory, and infused throughout with spiritual significance: "God so loved the world, that He gave His Only Begotten Son." And the Man, Jesus Christ, setting forth the perfect pattern of Sacrifice, offered not another life, but Himself. Self-sacrifice is the only perfect Sacrifice.

Looking back over the Old Covenant in the light of

this revelation of the perfect Sacrifice, we discover other features in the Jewish Sacrifices of significant meaning to those who had eyes to see. Such were three specially significant limitations of the material accepted for Sacrifice :

(1) The thing offered must be the personal property of the sacrificer : " of thy flock," " of the fruit of thy ground " (see, e.g., Exod. xxii. 29, xxiii. 16 ; Lev. i. 2, ii. 14 ; Deut. xii. 6, xxvi. 10, etc.). David feels it to be an offence against the fundamental principle of Sacrifice to accept Araunah's gift and offer unto the Lord Burnt Offerings which cost him nothing (2 Sam. xxiv. 24). Now this means that it is not the intrinsic value of the gift that God regards but its cost to the giver. By the mouth of the Psalmist He reminds His people that He does not need their gifts, for His " are the cattle upon a thousand hills " (Ps. l. 9, 10.) *It is the degree of self-sacrifice involved in the gift that makes it precious in His eyes* ; in other words, all Sacrifice, so far as it is worth anything in the sight of God, is self-sacrifice. In another Psalm this truth is stated outright : " Burnt offering and Sin-offering hast thou not required : then said I, Lo, I am come . . . to do Thy will, O, Lord " (Ps. xl. 6). The present forms of Sacrifice fade away and are no longer necessary or desired when the spiritual reality which they can only partially express is an accomplished fact.[1] All lower forms of Sacrifice are gathered

[1] This distinction between the outward and non-essential forms of Sacrifice and its inward permanent essential meaning is clearly grasped by Philo, "De Sacrificantibus," c.3 : "[The righteous] even if they bring nothing else . . . when they bring themselves . . . they are offering the most excellent of all sacrifices."

up and superseded in this perfect Sacrifice; there at last the inner devotion finds its full expression.

(2) The offerings chosen were the staple articles of daily food: oxen, sheep, goats, pigeons;[1] and of field produce, corn and oil and wine (*cf.* Ps. iv. 7). The ass, the horse, gold, jewels, and raiment were more highly treasured possessions, but were not permissible Offerings for Sacrifice. Why this limitation to the food Offerings? In part no doubt it goes back to Semitic heathenism and to the prehistoric ceremonial according to which feeding on the part of the god or the worshipper, or both, was an essential part of Sacrifice. But in other Semitic nations exceptions to this rule were frequent: the horse, the swine, the dog, and the mouse are examples (*cf.* Is. lxv. 4, lxvi. 3, 17); they were sometimes eaten at these heathenish sacrificial feasts, but forbidden as ordinary food. The Hebrew Sacrifices are strictly confined to the articles of daily food, i.e. the support of daily life. The connexion between food and life was closer to the Semitic mind than to ours. It rested not only on the common knowledge that our life depends upon food. This was reinforced by further ideas. The distinction between clean and unclean foods was based not only

[1] It has been disputed mainly on the ground of absence of allusion that the pigeon was one of the staple articles of food among the Hebrews (Robertson Smith's "Religion of the Semites," p. 219). If this were established, it might still be noted that the offering of a pigeon was exceptional. But the pigeon is the commonest of the birds not excluded as "unclean" (Deut. xiv. 11 ff; Lev. xi. 13 ff). And several allusions point to it as a domestic bird: Gen. viii. 8, 9; 2 Kings vi. 25 (the reading is only conjecturally disputed); Is. lx. 8. Pigeons were in common use as food in the New Testament times and are so at the present day. There is no reasonable ground for supposing that they formed an exception to the general rule of Sacrifice.

on physical and sanitary grounds, but on the notion that food has an effect on the man himself. A man's "soul" is made "abominable" by "unclean" food (Lev. xx. 25). Again, feeding together ("commensality") on the same flesh was held to constitute a real kinship where blood-kinship did not exist.[1] To share the same food establishes a unity of life between two men. In giving to God the flesh of the victim which would otherwise have gone to sustain and even to constitute his own life the sacrificer was making a gift which very closely represented himself. It would otherwise have passed into and constituted his own life, and the offering of it was in a sense a self-oblation.

(3) There is a third limitation with a like significance. Not even all kinds of food were offered in the Sacrifices. Wild game—apparently allowed in primitive times (Gen. xxvii. 4)—wild birds, fish, and the natural produce of the land which grew wild, such as wild fruit, milk, and honey,[2] though used as Offerings by other Semitic races, were not admitted in the list of Jewish Offerings. Of animals only those were included which belonged to the sacrificer himself: oxen, sheep, goats, and (for the poor) tame doves (see above). Wild animals, as well as honey, milk, and fruits were common in heathen sacrifices.[3] But in the Jewish regulations

[1] Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," p. 274; "Kinship," p. 149.

[2] Milk and honey (which includes the juices of certain fruits) were the typical natural products of an uncultivated fertile land, which was described as "flowing with milk and honey." Robertson Smith ("Semites," p. 220) thinks that the reason of their prohibition was that they were generally eaten fermented; but, if so, why was wine allowed?

[3] See "Encycl. Bib.," IV. 4188, 4193; Driver "Leviticus," note on Chap. I, ver. 2.

the Offering must be "of the herd and of the flocks" (Ex. xxii. 29, 30; Lev. i. 2; contrast Deut. xii. 15, 16). Normally in a pastoral or agricultural community this would imply the personal labour of the sacrificer in the rearing of the victim. When the development of city life made this no longer possible, in every case the feeling that it must cost the sacrificer something is still strong (2 Sam. xxiv. 24). If it did not represent his own personal labour directly, at least he must pay for it with money he had earned by the sweat of his brow. And in this we have again the hint that his Offering is a thing which stands in a close relation to the sacrificer himself. It represented a self-oblation.

When we come to examine the ceremonial of Sacrifice we shall see that the idea of an identity between the victim and the sacrificer is suggested there also, and especially by the laying on of hands.[1]

If, then, the most prominent underlying idea of Sacrifice at this stage is the offering of a gift to God, we may go further and add that the gift which is shown to be dearest of all to Jehovah is the offering of self. It is interesting and full of import that a spiritually minded Jew like Philo should have grasped this truth without the help of the Christian Revelation. In speaking of a Sacrifice which would be real and acceptable even if no animal victim were offered, he says: "For what is a true offering but the devout piety of a God-loving soul?"[2] The sacrificer is like the Burnt Offering he offers, "because he surrenders to God not only his first-fruits but also himself."[3]

[1] See pp. 62ff.
[2] "Vita Moysis," II (III), par. 10.
[3] "De Victimis," c. 14.

The righteous worshippers, "even if they bring nothing else, yet bringing themselves, the most complete entirety of goodness, they offer the best of Sacrifices, honouring God their Benefactor and Saviour with hymns and thanksgivings.[1]" The Scripture "regards as the Sacrifice not the victims but the mind and purpose of the sacrificer."[2] Here is another Jew who is not far from the Kingdom of Heaven.

[1] "De Sacrificantibus," par. 3.
[2] *Ibid.*, par. 6.

CHAPTER II

CLASSIFICATION OF THE SACRIFICES

WHEN we consider the different kinds of Sacrifice in the Jewish system, a cardinal distinction at once appears between the "Offerings of the fruit of the land" and "of the herd and the flock," the vegetable and animal Offerings. And to this distinction of kind is added a further difference of the means by which the Offering is made. The animal victim was given to God by the shedding of its blood, and this became so distinctive a feature of these offerings that their generic name was "the slaughter Offering" (*zebaḥ*). In distinction from these the vegetable Offerings are called the *minḥah* (= a gift, but with the further idea of a gift as an acknowledgment of the inferiority and dependence of the giver's relation to the receiver; a tributary gift). This word *minḥah* was originally applied to all kinds of Offerings, but afterwards confined to the "meal Offering" as distinct from the "slaughter Offering." In the later Priestly legislation the generic term for all kinds of Offerings is *corban* (= the thing presented to God), but the distinction between *minḥah* and *zebaḥ* is earlier than this. It is found in 1 Sam. iii. 14 ("The iniquity of Eli's house shall not be expiated with sacrifice [*zebaḥ*] nor offering [*minḥah*] for ever").

The *locus classicus* for this distinction is Ps. xl. 6, where the whole range of Sacrifices is covered by the two terms "sacrifice and offering Thou hast no delight in." The same terms, in their Greek equivalents, are used to cover the whole field of Sacrifice in Hebrews viii. 3: "Every High Priest is appointed to offer both gifts [δῶρα = *minḥah*] and sacrifices [θυσία = *zebaḥ*]." In English the word "Sacrifice" is commonly confined to the "slaughter Sacrifices," and this has become so usual that to the popular mind "Sacrifice" is essentially associated with the killing of a victim. We are almost compelled sometimes, however, to use the word in the wider sense, which its derivation [1] suggests, as covering all dedication of Offerings to God. It should be clear from the context whether the word is employed in the wider or the narrower sense, and so we hope that any confusion may be avoided.

Taking, then, this primary distinction let us consider first:

A. The "Offering" (*minḥah*), i.e. the bloodless or vegetable Offerings of the produce of the field. The *minḥah* had a subordinate place in the sacrificial system, and it is not quite certain whether in normal use it was an independent Offering. It might be so used as a substitute for a Sacrifice in case of extreme poverty (Lev. v. 11–13), and possibly also on other occasions, when offered privately. The public *minḥah* seems to have been always an accompaniment or appendage to a Sacrifice. Whether this was the case with the private *minḥah* or not, at any rate its subordinate position had this important effect, that it

[1] *Sacrificium*=something made "holy," i.e. by dedication to God.

was quite overshadowed in importance by the *zebaḥ*; when a Jew thought of oblation in general it would be the *zebaḥ* in particular that he had in mind. This dependent position of the *minḥah* was a natural legacy from primitive times when the Sacrifice was regarded as literally the food of the god. "When the Hebrew ate flesh he ate bread with it and drank wine, and when he offered flesh on the table of his God, it was natural that he should add to it the same concomitants which were necessary to make up a comfortable and generous meal." [1]

The ingredients of the *minḥah* were *corn* and *wine*, to which we must add *oil*, *salt*, and *frankincense*. Corn, wine, and oil were the staple vegetarian articles of daily food. The corn was offered parched (Lev. ii. 14), or ground into flour (*ibid.*) or made into a cake (*ibid.* 4). Oil was poured upon it in all these cases as in daily secular use. Salt is commanded in every case (*ibid.* 13), and the symbolism is explained by calling it "the salt of the covenant of thy God." Salt preserves food from corruption. This command is then the correlative of the prohibition against the use of leaven, with its opposite effect of producing fermentation and decay (*ibid.* 11). A covenant between men was cemented by a common meal (Gen. xxxi. 44–46), and the use of salt in this meal symbolized the inviolable nature of the covenant entered into, which was called "a covenant of salt for ever" (Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chronicles xiii. 5). As every Offering both rested upon the original Covenant with God for its acceptance, and also was in a sense a

[1] Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," p. 222. We might add that for the same reason oil would be poured over it.

renewing of the original Covenant Sacrifice with its accompanying meal (Ex. xxiv. 11), it was fitting that the inviolable steadfastness of this Covenant (Jer. xxxiii. 25, 26; Is. liv. 10) should be expressed by the symbol of the salt.[1]

Another accompaniment of the *minḥah* was frankincense (Lev. ii. 15; vi. 15), with this difference, however, that while the oil and salt were thoroughly mixed with the meal, the frankincense was so placed upon it that the whole of it was burnt. The whole of the frankincense was laid upon the portion assigned to God and burnt upon the altar. The Priest's portion was free from incense. It is possible, as Robertson Smith suggests,[2] that in the first instance the function of cleansing was attached to incense, the gum from a tree which is still regarded by the Arabs as "very holy." In the light of this idea the obligation of offering to God that which was clean may have been emphasized by sprinkling the incense on the *'Azkarah*

[1] *Cf.* Mark ix. 49, 50: "Every one shall be salted with fire." Whatever may be the exact meaning of this passage, certain points are clear:

(1) The reference to Lev. ii. 13, expressed in the (doubtful) addition "every sacrifice [*θυσία*, a regular LXX. equivalent for *minḥah* as well as *zebaḥ*] shall be salted with salt," at once gives the passage a sacrificial connexion. Those who would offer themselves to God must be "salted" to preserve them from rottenness.

(2) The function of salt is transferred to another purifying agency —the refiner's fire (*cf.* Zech. xiii. 9; Mal. iii. 3). This refining fire is different from the punitive destroying fire of the previous verses. The sacrificial fire was also regarded as a refining, etherializing agent in contrast with the fire that destroys (see pp. 79–81).

The preserving effect of salt is implied in other passages: "Have salt in yourselves" (Mark ix. 50); "Ye are the salt of the earth" (Matt. v. 13); "Let your speech be . . . seasoned with salt" (Col. iv. 6), i.e. have in it something to preserve it from degenerating into corrupt talk. Is it with reference to this thought that in the parallel passage (Eph. iv. 29) the apostle warns his converts against language that has "gone rotten" (*λόγος σαπρός*) for want of salt?

[2] "The Religion of Semites," p. 427.

only (the portion offered to God). But the idea of purifying in connexion with incense had disappeared (if it ever existed) in the historic times of the Hebrew religion, and its place was taken by another idea so well known that it can hardly have been absent from its symbolic significance in the Sacrifices. Incense is the symbol of prayer (Ps. cxli. 2 ; Rev. v. 8). The reason of the comparison is clear : as the smoke rises from the earthly altar up to Heaven, so the prayer rises from the heart of man to the throne of God : " Let my prayer be set forth as incense before Thee " (Ps. cxli. 2). So while the angelic " Tersanctus " was chanted in the Temple, " at the voice of him who cried," the house was filled with smoke (Is. vi. 4). And while Zacharias burnt the incense on the golden altar within the Holy Place, " the whole multitude were praying without at the hour of incense " (Luke i. 10). Incense is the " etherializer " of the prayers of the saints (Rev. viii. 3, 4). In the light of this we can hardly do otherwise, in this case, than connect the thought of prayer with the use of incense in the *minḥah*. This suggests a further reason why the incense should have been used with the *'Azkarah* only. Men who consume their food by eating it would not use frankincense with it as they used oil or salt : it would serve neither for nourishment nor for flavouring But God consumes His portion of the Offering by means of etherializing fire, to the smoke of which incense adds a special fragrance. From the material point of view there was, then, a reason why only the *'Azkarah* should be sprinkled with incense. But a spiritual reason also lies ready to hand. If incense

symbolizes the offering of worship, it is rightly restricted to God alone.

The *minḥah* subdivides naturally into two classes: (*a*) the *occasional* Offerings of individuals, or on behalf of the nation, (*b*) the *perpetual* public Offerings on behalf of the nation.

I. THE OCCASIONAL MINḤAH

(See regulations in Lev. ii., vi. 14 ff.)

These Offerings were made on the altar of Burnt Offering in the Court of the Temple (Lev. vi. 14). In the large majority of cases they were presented by private individuals, but they might be made also on behalf of the nation (e.g. Lev. ix. 17). This *minḥah* consisted of two parts, a solid and a liquid, which were probably not always combined. A meal Offering might be made without a drink Offering, but as far as we know a drink Offering never stood by itself. To the solid or cereal part of the *minḥah* (corn or flour or cake) the name *minḥah* is sometimes applied separately, while the liquid part is called the *drink Offering* (*nesek*). The whole Offering is then described as the *minḥah* (meal Offering) and *nesek* (drink Offering), e.g. Numbers vi. 15. But generally the term *minḥah* covers both the corn and the wine, where the Offering of the latter is included.

There are some points in the ceremonial of the cereal Offering which should be noticed. The first is that in no case did the offerer receive any share of the

Offering as he did in one of the slaughter Sacrifices (the Peace Offering). Perhaps it was in accordance with the whole idea of the *minḥah* (= tribute) that he was required to make an entire surrender of his gift to God and expect nothing for himself. Another significant point is the ceremonial connected with the *'Azkarah* mentioned above. The Priest was required (Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16, vi. 15) to separate a handful of the Offering, which was called "the memorial" (*'Azkarah*). The whole of the incense was to be placed upon the "memorial," which was then burnt upon the altar fire. The rest of the Offering was eaten by the Priests. The word *'Azkarah* (LXX, μνημόσυνον; R.V. "memorial") is derived from the causative form of the verb "to remember," and signifies, therefore, that which causes the Lord to remember, i.e. commends the sacrificer to the favourable notice of God. We may compare it with the idea in Isaiah lxii. 6, of the Lord's "remembrancers," who are to give Him no rest till He established Jerusalem; or, again, the "stones of memorial" upon the Ephod bearing the names of the Children of Israel "before Jehovah for a memorial" (*cf.* also Ex. xxx. 16; Numbers x. 10, xxxi. 54). Similarly, in Acts x. 4, Cornelius is told, "Thy prayers and thine alms are gone up for a memorial (μνημόσυνον) before God."

The *drink Offering* (Numbers xv. 1–10) of wine as the name *nesek* implies, was poured on the altar (Hos. ix. 4; *cf.* Ex. xxx. 9). The *nesek* is not mentioned in the laws directly relating to the Offerings (Lev. i to vii). Possibly the omission shows that it was regarded with some

suspicion, and as a fermented substance we should expect this to be the case. It is noteworthy that outside the Pentateuch the drink Offering is quite as often mentioned in connexion with the worship of heathen gods as of Jehovah.

II. THE PERPETUAL PUBLIC MINHAH

The perpetual public *minḥah* was offered regularly by the Priests on behalf of the nation, and the place of the Offering was the "Holy Place," the first of the two chambers of the Temple proper, in which stood the Table of Shewbread, the Golden Altar of Burnt Incense, and the Seven Branched Candlestick. The material of this *minḥah* was the same as in the private *minḥah*, but the ceremonial differed considerably. The Offering was made in three distinct ways:

(1) *Bread and wine* were set forth on the *Table of Shewbread* and renewed weekly, the old supply being eaten by the Priests alone (Ex. xxv. 23–30; Lev. xxiv. 5–9; *cf.* 1 Sam. xxi. 6; Mark ii. 26). Frankincense was placed upon the bread "for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord," the incense alone in this case being the *'Azkarah*, which was probably burnt at first on the Brazen Altar of Burnt Offering, and later (see next page) on the Golden Altar of Burnt Incense.

The word "Shewbread" means literally "Bread of the Face (or the Presence) of God," i.e. bread set out on a table before the Lord. (LXX. ἄρτοι προθέσεως).

The use of wine is inferred from the mention of flagons, bowls, and spoons (Ex. xxv. 29).

(2) Incense offered separately by being burnt on the Altar of Incense every morning and evening as a "perpetual" incense (Ex. xxx. 7, 8; *cf.* Luke i. 9). It is probable that the use of incense as a separate Offering was not introduced into worship until the period just before the Exile. The Altar of Incense is not mentioned in Solomon's Temple or in the reformed worship of Ezekiel (Chap. xl. ff.) or until the Levitical legislation.

The use of incense in worship probably arose from its secular use as a way of showing honour to a guest. On the general principle that what is pleasing to man would be also acceptable to a god it was introduced from social life into heathen religion, and from heathen cults it was imported into the worship of Jehovah. But here it came under the influence of a more spiritual atmosphere, which gave it a new and beautiful significance as the symbol of prayer (see above, p. 27).

(3) Oil offered separately by burning in the Seven Branch Candlestick (Ex. xxv. 31–40; Ex. xxvii. 20, 21, xxx. 7, 8; Lev. xxiv. 1–4 "to cause a lamp to burn continually.") Probably the lamps were only alight by night: this was certainly the case at an earlier time (1 Sam. iii. 3), and seems to be implied in Lev. xxiv. 3; Ex. xxvii, 21, xxx. 7, 8, *cf.* 2 Chron. xiii. 11. There is a reference to a seven branch candlestick in Zech. iv. 2.

The perpetual *minḥah* may have been meant as a sort of appendage to the daily public Burnt Offering,

similar to the relation between the occasional *minhah* and the private slaughter Sacrifices.

B. The Animal Offerings.—To all of these, in distinction from the *minḥah*, the name of "*slaughter Offering*" (*zebaḥ*) was applied. In later times *zebaḥ* was used specifically of the Peace Offering, though occasionally it is found in its wider sense (e.g. Ps. xl. 6). This would be natural if (as is probably the case) the Peace Offering was the most primitive form of Semitic Sacrifice. The name *zebaḥ*, given originally to the Peace Offering when it was the only kind of Sacrifice, naturally stuck to it afterwards, when other forms of Sacrifice had arisen. Ultimately, four forms of slaughter Sacrifice, called in our English Bible the Peace, Burnt, Trespass, and Sin Offerings, were recognized as parts of Jewish worship. The Burnt Offering, so far as we can trace it in the documents, dates from the earliest times; indeed, if we look at the Old Testament alone, we might regard it as equally primitive with the Peace Offering. It is only from the study of other Semitic religions that the Peace Offering appears as probably being the oldest form of Sacrifice. The Trespass Offering and the Sin Offering are hardly earlier than the Exile (see below).

These four historical kinds of Sacrifice have been arranged and classified in many different ways: in their chronological order (as above), or according to their differences of ceremonial, or according to their spiritual meanings and purposes. The most useful classification, however, will be the one which uses as a basis of division a feature not merely common to all four Sacrifices in different degrees or different ways,

but also at the same time of real significance in the Hebrew conception of Sacrifice. It is not of much value to classify them by a common feature which is comparatively unimportant.

This quest leads us ultimately to the all-important question of the spiritual meaning of the Sacrifices. To consider them merely from the point of view of their historical order, or of their ceremonial differences, is not enough by itself, because it only provokes the further questions: Why this order of time? Why these differences of ceremonial? And the answer to these questions is to be sought in the spiritual region. Now, there is one spiritual fact which is common to all the Sacrifices: they all express the human desire for fellowship with God. We may perhaps go a step further and say that all of them, even the most confident and joyful, imply some sort of consciousness that the fellowship with God is not a continual unbroken union, but needs to be renewed. To this renewal of fellowship we English have given the very expressive name of "at-one-ment." Now, if this consciousness is a fact, it supplies us with a very fundamental and significant basis of division, viz. the degree of at-one-ment present in the various Sacrifices. Applying this criterion we find we have to put them in the same order as the order of their historical origin, viz. (1) Peace, (2) Burnt, (3) Trespass, (4) Sin Offering. But the historical order has behind it a spiritual reason. Hebrew religion in its earliest form was pre-eminently a religion of joy, of festival and thanksgiving. Men felt gladly confident of the Divine favour, and the Peace Offering, the most joyous of the Sacrifices, particularly expressed

this sense of fellowship with God by the common meal shared between Him and His worshippers. But very soon, if not at the first, appeared a consciousness that the bond might need renewal, and so from quite early times Sacrifice was regarded as an atoning act, a means of reconciling, if any estrangement was felt to have crept in. Even the Peace Offering was, occasionally at least, regarded as an atoning Sacrifice. Traces of this are seen in 1 Sam. iii. 14 (where even the *minḥah* too has the same aspect; *cf. ibid.* xxvi. 19, where however, *minḥah* is probably used in the wider sense to include the *zebaḥ*, and Ezek. xlv. 15, 17). As time went on the early childlike gladness faded out of life, and in its place appeared a deepening sense that God had hidden His Face from them; they had forfeited the Divine favour and must needs recover it again. The cloud arose at first from the political troubles and anxieties which cast over the people a spell of gloom and an uneasy feeling that their God was not well pleased with them. As time went on it developed into an increasing conviction of sin and sinfulness, and a growing sense of the need of atonement. So it came about that new forms of Sacrifice grew up, expressing a deepened desire for atonement, and also the desire was read into the older Sacrifices which had been hitherto comparatively free from it. Of the class of new Sacrifices were the Trespass Offering and the Sin Offering; to the older class belong the Peace Offering and (probably) the Burnt Offering. In the Levitical period the atoning aspect of *all* slaughter Sacrifices was declared emphatically by the canon of Leviticus xvii. 11: "I have given it [i.e. the blood]

to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls." In this passage, no doubt, the Sin and Trespass Offerings are mainly in view, with the Burnt Offering included in a subordinate degree ; but on consideration it would be impossible to exclude the Peace Offering also. The old division into *expiatory* and *non-expiatory* Sacrifices was not strictly correct ; they should be arranged according to the degree of an atoning purpose present in all of them, i.e. (1) Peace Offering, (2) Burnt Offering, (3) Trespass Offering, (4) Sin Offering. This as we have already explained, is also probably the historical order of their origin in the religion of Israel. Let us take them then in this order.

I. THE PEACE OFFERING

As well as the name *zebaḥ*, dating from the time when it was probably the only form of slaughter Sacrifice, this offering was also called the "*zebaḥ-shelamim*," or simply "*shelamim*." It is not necessary here to enter into the vexed question of the original meaning of "*shelamim*." The ordinary English "Peace Offering" is taken from the LXX. translation θυσία εἰρηνική. In adopting this name, however, we must beware of a misconception. This Sacrifice is *not* the Sacrifice to *make peace* with an offended God. If the name were used in this sense the Peace Offering would be beyond all others *the* atoning Sacrifice. The peace to which it refers is a peace *already existing when the Offering is made* ; it is because the offerer *is* at peace with God that he dares to invite Him to eat and drink

with him. The Peace Offering was forbidden to anyone who was "unclean," and therefore out of communion with God (Lev. vii. 20). When it is compared with the Christian Communion this must be carefully borne in mind.

This consciousness of Divine favour made the Peace Offering the most joyous of all the animal Sacrifices. There is a note of gladness, of praise and thanksgiving (Lev. vii. 11 ff.) about it, which is repeatedly echoed in the Psalter (e.g. Ps. xxii. 25, 29, l. 14, lvi. 12, lxi. 8, lxv. 1, cvii. 22). It was peculiarly the Offering for festal occasions, and especially at the chief of all the feasts, the Passover. To eat and drink is the natural symbol of making merry. Were it not for the express statements in the older documents, such as 1 Sam. iii. 14, we should not have suspected that behind this gladness there lurked sometimes the thought of sin-separation from God. In any case this thought must have been generally quite in the background and overshadowed by the glad sense of the favour of God. In this connexion, too, the different kinds of Peace Offering reveal a further fact of significance. The offering of this Sacrifice was always occasioned by some particular benefit received or expected. The general sense of the Divine loving kindness broke out, as it were, into an act of thanksgiving when some particular mercy or blessing filled the heart to overflowing. It might be the commemoration of some great historical deliverance, as at the Passover, or just the thanksgiving of a humble individual for God's goodness to him personally. In any case it referred to some special occasion. The three kinds were

(1) the *Thank Offering* or *Sacrifice of Praise* or *Thanksgiving* for some particular benefit already received (Lev. vii. 12 ff.); (2) the *Freewill Offering* (Lev. vii. 16 ff.), probably of the nature of a voluntary "thanks in advance," a thank Offering made spontaneously at the time a thing was prayed for; (3) the Votive Offering, or vow, distinguished from the Thank Offering in that it was the fulfilment of a vow, and therefore obligatory; and distinguished from the Freewill Offering by the further fact that it was offered *after* the prayer was answered and the blessing received (see Lev. vii. 16 ff., xxii. 21). Both the Freewill Offering and the vow seem to have taken the form occasionally of a Burnt Offering instead of the usual Peace Offering (see Lev. xxii. 18; Ps. lxvi. 13).

The central and distinctive idea of the Peace Offering, a fellowship with God, was expressed by its peculiar ceremonial feature—the common meal. The portion assigned to God consisted of the blood (poured upon the altar) and the fat, which, being commonly regarded as the vital essence of the flesh, was forbidden food to men (Lev. vii. 22). The Priest's portion was the *heave thigh* and the *wave breast* (Lev. vii. 30, 32, 34). The *waving* was a ceremonial act expressive of the Priest's offering this portion to God and receiving it back from Him. The expression "Wave Offering" is used of a thing offered to God and returned by Him (e.g. the Levites offered to the Lord and returned by Him "as a gift to Aaron and his sons" to assist them in the Tabernacle ministry, Num. viii. 11–22). The word "heave" seems to be used of taking a part from a larger whole, e.g. the first-fruits from the whole

crop ; so here the right thigh from the whole carcass. There would seem to be this distinction, that the breast was offered to God in acknowledgment that it was His due, and given back by Him to His Priest, while the thigh was simply taken from the offerer's portion. Thus the position of the Priest as mediator and bridge between God and man was indicated : his portion was derived partly from " the portion of the Lord " and partly from the layman's share.[1] The rest of the flesh was then eaten by the sacrificer and his friends. It was a meritorious act to invite guests and especially the poor to share in this banquet with its associations of sacred and social festivity (1 Sam. ix. 13 ; 2 Sam. vi. 19, xv. 7–11 ; Neh. viii. 10, *cf.* Ps. xxii. 26).

We have already spoken of the ideas associated by the Semitic peoples with the act of feeding together at the same table and from the same food.[2] The common meal in social life not only cemented an alliance of friendship, but even constituted a sort of kinship as valid as blood kinship.[3] The same life-giving food entered into the lives of those who shared it and united them by a kind of vital identity. In prehistoric heathen Sacrifice, when the victim was identified with the god, the common life which united the worshippers was the divine life ; their god became their life within them ; they partook of his being. When the animal victim was distinguished from the

[1] This is especially true of the Levitical legislation, but the Priest's portion seems to have varied at different periods ; see 1 Sam. ii. 13 ff. ; Deut. xviii. 3.

[2] See pp. 19, f.

[3] See Robertson Smith, " Kinship," p. 148 ff. ; " Religion of the Semites," pp. 274, 313.

god, the union of the worshippers with their god was effected in the kinship established by the common meal. Something of these ideas, no doubt, survived in the Jewish Peace Offering; but not enough to convey to the worshipper any sense of Divine indwelling through the Sacrifice. There is no hint in the Old Testament that men became partakers of the Divine nature through this sacred banquet. Here again we have to notice a radical distinction between the Peace Offering and the Christian Communion. Indeed the expression "Communion with God" applied to the Peace Offering is liable to this very serious misunderstanding through its Christian association. It would be better to substitute for it "*Fellowship* with God."

A comparison with the ceremonial of the Covenant Sacrifice (Ex. xxiv. 5–11) illustrates further the nature of this fellowship with God. The sacrificial "blood of the Covenant" is there applied to the altar (as representing God) and the people. God and His people are united in a holy bond by "partaking" of the same sacred *life-blood*. The people are "consecrated" by its touch: *cf.* the same use of the blood in the consecration of a Priest (Ex. xxix. 20, 21; Lev. viii. 30, 31). This sharing in a common life-blood inaugurated the Covenant relationship between God and His people at the first, and that relationship once established was afterwards continued in the common meal of the Peace Offering. While blood alone can create the vital union, its continuance is sufficiently secured by the sharing of common food. In the most primitive times we know that the "blood" of the victim was drunk by the worshippers. It was

later that the sacredness of the "blood," as the life, led to its being forbidden as human food, and its touch was substituted as man's share in the Covenant ceremony by which God and His people were made one. The consecrating efficacy of the touch of blood is evidently to be explained from the most primitive type of Sacrifice in which the tribe and their god were united in one life by feeding together on the same life-blood. Something of the same train of thought most probably lay behind the putting of the blood on the doorpost in the original Passover ceremony. The house and its occupants were united to Jehovah in a sacred bond by the touch of the same life-blood, part of which was given to Him on His altar, and the other part put on the doorpost. Thus was first inaugurated that peculiar tie between Him and the people of Israel, which was afterwards reconstituted (see Ex. xxiv. 5–11) on a more definite Covenant basis, viz. the Law and its observance (this is the significance of the "Book of the Covenant" in Ex. xxiv. 7; it contained the terms of the Covenant).

II. THE BURNT OFFERING

This comes next in the ascending degree of atonement. The expression "to make atonement" is very frequently used of the Burnt Offering, and especially during the time before the Exile, when it was the principal atoning Sacrifice (see e.g. 1 Sam. vii. 9; Mic. vi. 6, 7). But all through its later history also the idea of atonement clings to the Burnt

Offering (*cf.* Job i. 5, xlii. 8; Lev. i. 4, xvi. 24). There is no doubt that this intention is much stronger here than in the Peace Offering.

The origin of the Burnt Offering is shrouded in mystery. The earliest documents of the Old Testament, such as the early narratives in Genesis, connect it with the most primitive times. The Sacrifices of Abel (Gen. iv. 4), Noah (*ibid.* viii, 20), and the Patriarchs (e.g. Abraham, *ibid.* xxii. 2) invariably take the form of a Burnt Offering. They imply, indeed, that it was the oldest of all the Sacrifices, and, as we saw above, it is only our knowledge of heathen Semitic Sacrifice and the tell-tale fact that *zebaḥ*, the Jewish name for Sacrifice in general, was also the specific name for the Peace Offering in particular, which makes it almost certain that the latter, and not the Burnt Offering, was the oldest form of Sacrifice from which the others were evolved. Where the two are found side by side in the early documents, it is noticeable that the Burnt Offering seems to have been felt to be the more appropriate for times of anxiety (as at the opening of a campaign, Judges vi. 26; 1 Sam. xiii. 10), or of grief and fear (e.g. 1 Sam. vii. 9). The peculiar feature of the Burnt Offering (the burning of the whole carcass on the altar) set forth the worshipper's desire to abstain from the common meal, and to hand over the whole of his Offering to God. From this we readily see how the Burnt Offering came to be associated with the idea of atonement. The feeling that for some reason God might be displeased led to the desire to propitiate Him by making over the whole victim to Him as a gift rather than to assume

the relation of fellowship which the common meal of the Peace Offering implied.

The two Hebrew names for the Burnt Offering both refer to the peculiar feature of its ceremonial, viz. the burning of the *whole* body of the victim upon the altar. They are *olah* (= that which goes up, i.e. in smoke, to heaven; or, possibly, but less probably, that which is brought up to the altar), and *kalil*, "whole," translated in E.V. as "the whole Burnt Offering." Both names, as well as the ceremonial on which they are based, emphasize the fact that in the Burnt Offering the chief idea is the offering of a gift to God as distinct from the sharing of a common possession (as in the Peace Offering). Further, the gift offered is not merely a precious possession, but a possession representing the giver's own self [1] by offering which he made in symbol the Offering of himself, soul and body. This latent meaning of self-oblation is brought out clearly in the New Testament, e.g. Romans xii. 1.

Unlike the Peace Offering and the Trespass or Sin Offerings, the making of the Burnt Offering needed no special occasion to call it forth, nor did it have reference to any particular event or experience in the mind of the offerer. It was the only Sacrifice that was general rather than special in its bearing on the sacrificer's relation with his God. While the Peace Offering was made with reference to some particular mercy of God, and the Trespass and Sin Offerings with reference to some particular sin, the Burnt Offering was a general acknowledgment of the

[1] See pp. 16–22.

whole duty of man to God, and especially of Israel to Jehovah. Self-surrender and self-dedication are the keynotes of Israel's relation to God under the Covenant He had made with His people. That Covenant is compared with a marriage contract (e.g. Jer. iii. 14; Hos. i–iii) and as the wife gives herself altogether to her husband, so should Israel present herself to Jehovah. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" is the Deuteronomic summary of the Law (Deut. vi. 5), as "Ye shall be holy unto me: for I the Lord am holy and have separated you from the peoples that ye should be mine" is the Levitical (Lev. xx. 26). Both intentions were expressed in the ceremonial of the Burnt Offering. The representative character of the victim and the burning of the entire carcass set forth the completeness of the self-surrender; and the surrendered self was offered to God upon the altar, which by its sanctifying touch and the etherializing fire made the gift "holy to the Lord"—dedicated it (Exod. xxix. 37; *cf.* Matt. xxiii. 19). It was natural and appropriate, then, that this Sacrifice, expressing the normal duty of Israel to Jehovah, should be chosen for the daily public Offering on behalf of the nation (see Exod. xxix. 38–42; Numb. xxviii. 3–8; Lev. vi. 8 ff.; but the custom is earlier than the Priestly Code, e.g. 2 Kings xvi. 15). Originally offered in the morning only, the evening "oblation" being a *minḥah* (1 Kings xviii. 29, 36), after the Exile it was commanded in the evening as well. It was known as the "continual Burnt Offering" (Numb. xxviii. 3; Exod. xxix. 42),

bearing its perpetual witness that the people of Jehovah owed themselves and all they possessed to their God. Public Sacrifices were practically always either Burnt or Sin Offerings. If the Sacrifice had for its special purpose the making of atonement, a Sin Offering was offered ; but otherwise a Burnt Offering. The Trespass Offering was always private, and the Peace Offering, which originally in Semitic heathen religion was *always* a corporate tribal act, in course of time became a personal, or at most, a family Sacrifice. The Passover was a domestic as distinct from a national Offering ; every family had its own lamb (Exod. xii. 3). So the only *general* public Sacrifice (i.e. without special intention) was the Burnt Offering.

III. THE TRESPASS OR GUILT OFFERING

We now come to those Sacrifices in which the sense of sin and the need of atonement were uppermost. In the Peace and Burnt Offerings other ideas and feelings occupied the foreground, sin and atonement being subordinate to them. In the Trespass and Sin Offerings the whole intention is that of penitence and the desire for reconciliation. The order of origin is again the order of ascending degree of atonement and directs us first to the *asam*, the Trespass Offering (to call it by its familiar name—that of the A.V.) or the Guilt Offering (as the R.V. translates the Hebrew). The earliest form of this Offering was a gift counted as a recompense for wrong inflicted on anyone, e.g. the golden mice and tumours sent by the Philistines

to the Israelites when the ark was restored (1 Sam. vi. 3–5). Before the Exile there is mention of an *aṣam* as a money payment made to the Priests (2 Kings xii. 16). The *aṣam* first appears as a Sacrifice in Ezekiel's legislation (Ezek. xl. 39, etc.); but Ezekiel seems to imply that his readers would be already familiar with it, and we may perhaps date its origin as Sacrifice just before the Exile. Its meaning and purpose are first defined in the Priestly Code (Lev. v. 14ff., vi. 6; Numb. v. 6–10.[1] The *Guilt Offering* was for sins for which a reparation in kind was possible. It presupposed a legal compensation (called in Numb. v. 8, the *aṣam*, as if distinct from the Sacrifice, a usage recalling the original meaning of the word), consisting of entire restitution of the loss inflicted, plus a fine of an additional fifth of the loss (Numb. v. 7; *cf.* Lev. vi. 5). Together with this compensation the Guilt Offering atoned for the sin in its moral aspect. The ceremonial of the Guilt Offering was the same as that of the Burnt Offering, except that the fat only was burnt on the altar, the rest of the carcass being eaten by the Priests. This point of ceremonial it shared in common with the Sin Offering, from which it differed, however, in the application of the blood; here it followed the usage of the Peace and Burnt Offerings. One peculiar feature recalls the distinctive character of the Trespass Offering: the victim was valued by the authorities (Lev. v. 15, 18, vi. 6), as if its cost formed part of the compensation made. This

[1] Lev. v. 1–13 refers to the Sin Offering in spite of the use of the word *aṣam* in verses 6, 7, which retains its older meaning of a "fine," or "recompense." This is more probable than that the passage confuses the two kinds of Offerings.

was the only trace in the sacrificial system of any idea of paying a recompense to God for sin. It is noteworthy also that, judged by modern ethical standards, the sins for which a Trespass Offering was demanded were more culpable than the merely ceremonial offences (see below) " covered " by the Sin Offering. Conscious theft, fraud, and false swearing are included (Lev. vi. 1–3) as well as " unwitting " offences.

One of the most interesting facts with regard to the Trespass Offering is the use of the word *aṣam* in Is. liii. 10. Speaking of the suffering servant of Jehovah, the Prophet says : " When Thou shalt make his soul an *aṣam* " (see R.V. margin). This part of Isaiah was probably written just before the close of the Exile, and the Prophet was almost certainly familiar with Ezekiel's legislation, and therefore we may be fairly sure that the *aṣam* is here used in the sacrificial sense. The Servant is the victim in a Trespass Offering, and his life-blood (soul) on the altar makes atonement for the sins of his people. His sufferings and death are thus brought into line with the Sacrifices, and particularly the atoning Sacrifices, of the Old Covenant. The mention of the Trespass Offering rather than the Sin Offering, the highest atoning Sacrifice, is explained by the fact that the Sin Offering, which did not exist as a Sacrifice before the Exile, is only used in Ezekiel in connexion with cleansing persons and things for sacred offices, and has not the general atoning aspect it bears in Ezra's legislation. At the time of Isaiah liii. 10 the Trespass Offering was the highest atoning Sacrifice.

IV. THE SIN OFFERING

The Hebrew word *ḥaṭṭath* first of all means "sin" itself. In 2 Kings xii. 16, along with the *aṣam*, it is used of a money payment to the Priests, evidently in compensation for offences. It is not until Ezekiel that *ḥaṭṭath* is used of a Sacrifice.[1] With him the Sin Offering is mainly, if not entirely, connected with consecration and cleansing (Ezek. xliii. 18 ff., xliv. 27, xlv. 18 ff.). It is only in the Priestly Code (that is, with the legislation of Ezra) that it has become a regular Sacrifice for the "covering" of sin; and here it is the chief of the atoning Sacrifices. Its pre-eminence is shown by the fact that it was the Offering appointed on the great Day of Atonement, and also by the peculiar feature of its ceremonial. In all other Sacrifices the blood was "poured" upon the altar; in the Sin Offering alone it was "put" upon the *horns* of the altar.[2]

Comparing the Sin and Trespass Offerings with our modern standards of guilt and responsibility, we should undoubtedly expect the opposite of this. The Sin Offering is in all instances for "unwitting" offences, and with two possible exceptions (Lev. v. 1, 4) offences against the laws of ceremonial cleanness.

The failure to bear witness when called upon and the rash vow are the only cases involving what we should consider moral guilt, and that only in a minor degree. Even these (see above) very possibly belonged to the Trespass Offering.

[1] The reference in Lev. xxiii. 19, belongs almost certainly to the later Priestly redactor and not to the original Law of Holiness.

[2] For discussion of the significance of this act in the Sin Offering, see pp. 74–76.

The Trespass Offering, on the other hand, was intended to meet cases of fraud, i.e. real sins consciously committed, acts which according to our standards would certainly require a higher atoning sacrifice than the others. We have to remember that the Law made no distinction between moral and ceremonial offences: both were equally breaches of the rule of life commanded by God. Even an unwitting offence made the offender "unclean," as physical contact with disease might infect his body. A great part of the Prophets' mission to Israel was to "moralize" the Law, and so prepare the way for its "fulfilment" in the Gospel. But when we remember "it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins," it becomes of deep significance that the highest atoning Sacrifice of the Old Covenant should have been appointed for sins which were not sins. It was a Divine "irony" for those who could understand, and a hint that these things were only "a copy and shadow of the heavenly things." We have to bear in mind also that in the case of the Trespass Offering the Sacrifice was only an adjunct to a recompense already made. Damages had to be paid to the injured person before the wrongdoer might offer his Sacrifice. In this case, therefore, the atonement was divided between the compensation and the Sacrifice, while in the Sin Offering the whole burden fell upon the Sacrifice, and the offender acknowledged his inability to make any restitution for the wrong done. It is intelligible then, even if from a higher standpoint it is indefensible, that the Sin Offering should be the chief atoning Sacrifice.

Moreover this same indefensibility is not without a purpose and a significance; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews finds in it his chief argument for the superiority of the Gospel.

The special connexion of the Sin Offering with ceremonial cleanness explains its use in services of dedication. The blood, or even the flesh, of the Sin Offering was "most holy." It "hallowed" everything which it touched; even a garment or a vessel accidentally touched by it was to be washed or scoured before being used again (Lev. vi. 27, 28). It was by the blood of a Sin Offering that the Tabernacle and the altar were originally consecrated (Exod. xxix. 35–37) and purified from pollution by a reconsecration each year on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 15–19). In connexion with this it is to be remembered that as a Sacrifice the Sin Offering first appears in Ezekiel's vision as a means of consecrating persons and things (see above). And it is probable that from first to last this was the root idea of the Sin Offering. The offences, for which it was appointed, had the effect of making the offender "unclean," i.e. cut off from relationship with God. The Sin Offering purified him and reconsecrated him. He was restored to membership of the people made "holy to the Lord."[1] Now the act of consecration involves a double process.[2] First, it is the "separation" of a thing or person from among the "profane" things of ordinary everyday life—the things that are "common or unclean." This is a "cleansing" act, purifying the object from previous pollutions. Secondly, it is a separation of a

[1] See further on this, p. 114.

[2] See Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," p. 427.

more positive kind—a separating, a setting apart of the person or thing as "holy," i.e. belonging to God: a hallowing or sanctifying or dedication, a consecration in the more proper sense. These two ideas "cleansing" and "consecrating," each the converse of the other, are constantly associated as the effects produced by contact with Sacrificial Blood; see e.g. Ezek. xliii. 20, 22, 26; Lev. xvi. 19; Exod. xxix. 36; *cf.* Heb. ix. 13. In the last passage it is suggestive that the author combines the same two ideas in speaking of the "sprinkling" of the Blood of Jesus: "How much more shall the Blood of Christ . . . *cleanse* your conscience from dead works to *serve the living God.*" The combination is implied also in Heb. x. 19, 22, where the consecration of the believer is described: "Having therefore boldness to enter into the holy place [a right belonging only to those who had been consecrated to the Priesthood] by the Blood of Jesus . . . let us draw near . . . having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience."

Another point of interest is the choice of a victim for this Sacrifice. In contrast with the Burnt Offering, the victim was one single animal, as if to exclude any possible idea of quantitative compensation. For a public Sin Offering (and this includes a Sacrifice offered by a public official, the King or the Priest) the victim was always either a bullock or a goat (Lev. iv. 1–26, xvi.); for a private person, a lamb or a goat; or, in case of poverty, pigeons or even a meal Offering of flour. The victims in the greatest of all Sin Offerings, on the Day of Atonement, were a bullock for the High Priest and a goat for the people; in reference

to this fact it is with the " blood of bulls and goats " that the Epistle to the Hebrews contrasts the Blood of Christ (e.g. Heb. ix. 12, x. 4). The Baptist's description of Our Redeemer as " the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world " has been generally adopted in Christian language (e.g. 1 Pet. i. 19; Rev. v. 6) and Christian art to portray Our Lord as the Sacrificial Victim. But it must be remembered that the lamb was not chosen in this connexion as being the traditional victim in the highest Sin Offerings, but for other reasons: chiefly in reference to Isaiah liii., (*cf.* Acts viii. 32), and also to the Passover Lamb (Exod. xii. 3 ff.; *cf.* 1 Cor. v. 7 and Our Lord's reference at the Last Supper to His coming death).

It may be useful here to sum up in tabular form the conclusions we have reached as to the order of these four Sacrifices, the intention of each, and its ceremonial expression. In the last column we need only insert the ceremonial act *peculiar* to each class of Sacrifice: it is in the ceremonial peculiar to it that each kind of Offering found expression for its proper intention. In the next chapter will be found some account of the *full* ceremonial of all the Sacrifices. Putting them in the order given above we have the following table:

Offering	*Intention*	*Peculiar Ceremonial*
(1) Peace Offering	Expression of fellowship with God.	The common meal.
(2) Burnt Offering.	Expression of self-surrender and self-dedication.	The burning of the whole carcass.
(3) Trespass Offering	Recompense for wrong.	No *single* peculiar feature.[1]
(4) Sin Offering.	Atonement for sin.	The blood " put " on horns of altar.

[1] See pp. 59, 60.

We have treated the Sacrifices in their order of origin because, as we saw, their historical order resulted from a natural development in Hebrew religious thought.

But they can be arranged on another principle which will lead to a different order of succession. When the four (or, rather, three, for the Trespass Offering came to be quite overshadowed by the Sin Offering) were already established, a spiritual mind might seek to combine them on some principle of spiritual succession, much as, for instance, a liturgy is built up by the arrangement of prayers in an intelligible spiritual order. Now, when we consider the intentions of the different classes of Offering, a spiritual order of succession at once suggests itself. Before sinful man can draw near to God he needs something to remove the barrier between himself and God, something to "make atonement" for himself. This was provided by the *Sin Offering*. When the sin-caused barrier is removed, he is free to dedicate himself afresh to God, and it his duty to do so; and this was the "intention" of the Burnt Offering. Finally, in the Peace Offering the sacrificer expressed that sense of fellowship with God, which is the Divine response to self-dedication. Justification, dedication, union constitute the spiritual order; to the Jewish mind it would express itself as (1) restoration of the Covenant relationship (impaired by sin); (2) fulfilment of the normal Covenant obligation, i.e. a self-dedication (see above under *Burnt Offering*); (3) enjoyment of Covenant privilege, i.e. fellowship with God. Remembering this, and bearing in mind our general principle

(see Preface) of belief in the overruling guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is significant that the three Offerings (Sin, Burnt, Peace) are very frequently found in combination and almost invariably in this very order of succession. (See e.g. Exod. xxix. 14, 18, 28; Lev. v. 8, 10, viii. 14, 18, ix. 7, 8, 12, 22, xiv. 19, 20, 22, 31, xv. 15, 30, xvi. 11, 24; Numb. vi. 11, 16, 17, viii. 12; Ezek. xliii, 19, 27; it will be seen that sometimes the Peace Offering is omitted, but the sequence is not disturbed).[1] It would seem to have been the general rule that a Sin Offering should be followed by a Burnt Offering: i.e. the worshipper is not allowed to rest content with the negative removal of past sin, but must proceed to a renewed dedication of life to God. He must be not only "dead unto sin" but also "alive unto God." In the pre-Exilic period before the Sin and Trespass Offerings came into existence, the order (Burnt and Peace Offering) is otherwise carefully observed.[2]

The frequent occurrence of the three Offerings in combination suggests a further thought: viz., that the ideal purpose of Sacrifice is only realized in its

[1] The only exceptions to this order occur in the Book of Numbers (e.g. vii. 27-29; xxviii. 11, 15, 19, 22). It is of interest that they should be confined to one book, and if the reason could be discovered it might be found to have some bearing on the problems connected with the authorship of the Pentateuch. But in some at least of the instances the order given is not necessarily the order of sequence, and in any case the exceptions are few enough not to disturb the general rule.

[2] See 1 Sam. vi. 15, x. 8, xiii. 9; 2 Sam. vi. 17, xxiv. 25; Ex. xviii. 12, xxiv. 5, xxxii. 6 (all J.E. passages); Josh. viii. 31; Judges xx. 26, xxi. 4; 1 Kings iii. 15, viii. 64, ix. 25; 2 Kings xvi. 13; Ezek. xlv. 15, xlvi. 2; Is. lvi. 7; 1 Chron. xvi. 2, 3, xxi. 26; 2 Chron. vii. 1. The only exceptions to this order are found in 2 Kings x. 24; 2 Chron. xxix. 24. But the order in these passages (Peace, Burnt Offering) is not essentially the order of Sacrifice.

completeness by the three taken together—Forgiveness, Dedication, Communion. The three cover the whole range of religious devotion, and, by including all three, Sacrifice becomes co-extensive with the entire area of worship and the consecrated daily life which alone gives meaning and reality to worship. So when Our Lord came to "fulfil the Law," His Sacrifice was the fulfilment not of one only but of all four types of Sacrifice under the Old Covenant. He gathered into one Sacrifice the intentions of Sin Offering, Trespass Offering, Burnt Offering, and Peace Offering: atonement, satisfaction for sin, dedication, communion.[1] It is to His perfect Sacrifice that we look for the final revelation of Sacrifice in its ideal perfection. We see there how the four previously distinct Sacrifices are combined and focused in one. Each of them by itself presented but a partial aspect of one complete whole. It was then a wonderful and providential forecast of future perfection that the old Sacrifices should have been so frequently combined, and with such uniformity in their order of succession. Even if it were shown that this order arose in some dim, prehistoric past out of mere matter-of-fact or even sordid circumstances, unconnected with such high and spiritual ideas, we have only to consider what we mean by Providence to see that this would not invalidate our argument. It would only be another instance of the way in which the Allforeseeing God overrules the blind choice of men in one generation to be a vehicle of teaching to a later age. The history of Comparative Religion is seen to be full of such

[1] See pp. 125, 126.

instances, when once we admit the conclusions of a living faith in Divine Providence working through the ages. The very fact of Sacrifice is itself a remarkable case in point. How is it that the Cross of Christ should be foreshadowed away back in the very beginnings of primitive heathen Sacrifice? That with all their barbaric crudity and grossness they should yet contain within themselves the germs of such high truths?

Before we leave this subject we should note some significant limitations in the scope and purpose of the Jewish Sacrifices. First, that no one of those Sacrifices had any *grace-giving* power. Either they expressed some *present* feeling of the sacrificer (the Burnt Offering, his desire to offer himself to God; the Peace Offering, his sense of fellowship with God) or they refer to something in the past (the Peace Offering, as a thanksgiving for a past blessing; the Sin and Trespass Offerings, to make atonement for some past offence). *No Sacrifice looked forward to the future,* far less contained any promise of grace to meet future temptations. In this respect they stand in strong contrast with the Christian Sacrifice. "The Law was given by Moses; *grace* and truth came by Jesus Christ" (St. John i. 17). "If there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the law" (Gal. iii. 21). In this connexion we may refer the reader to our remarks on the common meal in the Peace Offering.[1] It is immaterial for the present purpose whether God or the sacrificer is to be regarded as the host in the

[1] See p. 39.

sacrificial meal.[1] In either case, the meal is the expression of a fellowship *already existing*; it did not create or restore the fellowship.

There are other limitations which present the same contrast with the Christian Sacrifice. In one respect only could the Jewish Sacrifices be regarded in the light of a prayer or a means of obtaining a gift from God, i.e. the "making of atonement" for sin. This may be regarded as equivalent to a prayer for cleansing and forgiveness. But it is when we come to the forgiveness of sins that the contrast between the Sacrifices of the Law and the Gospel is most startling. At the outset, the very conception of sin is radically different in the Levitical Law and in the Gospel (or indeed in the Prophets of the Old Testament and to a lesser extent in the Deuteronomic Law). We have seen[2] that the Law made no distinction between moral and merely ceremonial offences in respect of guiltiness. Both alike are violations of the "commandments of the Lord" and bring guilt upon the offender. A breach of the ceremonial regulations (e.g. as to food) involves "iniquity" just as if it were a moral sin. We saw also[3] that the highest atoning Sacrifice, the Sin Offering, was almost solely for ceremonial offences. Except for one or two cases

[1] The point is disputed (see references in Kurtz, p. 164), but I cannot help feeling that the ceremonial of the Peace Offering points to the sacrificer as host. The "fat" and "the blood" alone were presented on the altar: the wave-breast and heave-thigh seem to constitute the Priest as sharer in the meal, representing both God and the sacrificer (see p. 37); the rest of the carcass remained the sacrificer's property throughout as his portion in the meal. It was not offered to God and returned by Him.

[2] See p. 48. [3] See p. 47.

of fraud covered by the Trespass Offering,[1] the Law provided no expiation for the real moral offences such as theft, adultery, lying. Again, even the ceremonial offences were only forgivable if committed "unwittingly." This involves a totally different conception of sin. Even unconscious offences were counted under the Law as sins. The offence was regarded as residing in the act itself apart from the agent. From the legalist point of view the Jewish lawyers saw no inherent contradiction in the repeated formula of Lev. iv. to vi., "If a man sin unwittingly and be guilty" (*ibid.* iv. 27), or the downright statement of v. 17, "If anyone sin . . . . . though he knew it not, yet is he guilty and shall bear his iniquity." Whether the "unwittingness" might be stretched to include sins of infirmity is not certain: in Numb. xv. 30, the sins contrasted with unwitting offences (verses 22–29) are acts done "with a high hand" (*lit.* "with the hand lifted up," i.e. deliberately and defiantly). The iniquity for these cannot be expiated by Sacrifice (*cf.* 1 Sam. iii. 14; Heb. x. 28); the offender is beyond the reach of sacrificial expiation: "That soul shall be utterly cut off, his iniquity shall be upon him" (Numb. xv. 31).[2]

We see then how the Sacrificial Code of the Old

[1] See p. 46.

[2] There is a further doubt as to whether the Sin Offerings on the Day of Atonement provided forgiveness for more real and serious sins. On the one hand, we have the repeated emphasis on "*all* the sins," etc., of the people in Lev. xvi. 16, 21, and the fact that the Day of Atonement was unique in many respects (see *post*, p. 85). On the other hand, there is the probability that "all the sins" means only all offences of the kinds mentioned above and generally included under the expiating efficacy of Sacrifice. And this probability comes nearer to a certainty when we find these sins described in Heb. ix. 7 as "ignorances," (ἀγνοήματα).

Covenant was overruled by the Inspiring Spirit of God to confess its own inability to win forgiveness of sins. The overruling is the more evident because the Jews themselves looked upon these unwitting ceremonial offences as "sins." But the Sacrifices were only shadows and not realities, and the sins were only nominal sins. For real and grave sin the Law provided no atoning Sacrifice: the offender could only seek forgiveness by casting himself in penitence upon the mercy of God. God required no Sacrifice from the sinner—only the broken and contrite heart (Ps. li. 16, 17; *cf.* 2 Sam. xii. 13). "It is impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin" (Heb. x. 4).

CHAPTER III

THE CEREMONIAL ACTS OF SACRIFICE

THE table shown overleaf will be found useful as a summary of this part of the subject. A few words may be added in explanation. The order in which the Sacrifices are here arranged has no significance : it is adopted merely for the convenience of arranging the vertical lines. The five ceremonial acts are given in their time order. In the vertical lines a broken line means that there is no difference between the Sacrifice in question and its neighbour in regard to that particular act ; a solid line draws attention to a *peculiar* feature of ceremonial. Only the more important and significant ceremonial acts are mentioned. The table shows at a glance that in regard to the first three acts (presentation, laying on of hands, slaughtering) all four Sacrifices were alike ; the peculiarities are to be found in the use of the blood and the body of the victim. The Sin Offering alone shows a peculiar use of the blood ; in the disposal of the victim's carcass the Sin and Trespass Offerings were alike, but the Burnt and Peace Offerings had each its peculiar feature (the holocaust and the common meal). It will be noticed that the Trespass Offering has no one feature peculiar to itself ; its peculiarity lies in its combination of the ceremonial acts.

Burnt Offering.	Peace Offering.	Trespass Offering.	Sin Offering.
I. Presentation			
II. Laying on of Hands			
III. SLAUGHTERING			
IV. Blood	poured on	Altar	Blood put on Horns of Altar.
V. Carcase Burnt	FAT	ONLY	BURNT
	Breast and thigh eaten by Priests. The rest eaten by sacrificer and his friends.	Rest eaten	by Priests only.

Parts of the above ceremonial were probably derived from the primitive Semitic Sacrifices and originally served a different purpose and bore a different meaning from that of the Levitical Code. The latter is true also of their significance in periods of Hebrew history previous to the Exile. In all probability the same ceremonial received different interpretations at different stages of religious growth.[1] For our purpose the archæological questions of the origin and primitive meaning of the ceremonial acts concern us only in so far as they throw light upon their significance in the Levitical Code, out of which emerged the sacrificial ideas of the Christian Church. That the acts had a meaning is plain from Lev. xvii. 11;

[1] Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," p. 399.

they were not meaningless but significant ceremonies. The Law seems to imply that their meaning was obvious to the Jews ; where it is not so to us we shall have to try to recover it from our knowledge of Jewish social and religious life.

Before considering the acts in detail we may notice that there are three living agents in all Sacrifice : the offerer, the victim, the Priest. If what we saw above is true, that the ideal perfect Sacrifice must be a self-oblation the first two agents at least will be ultimately merged in one and the same person ; but, even so, it is all important that they should be distinguished in thought. Much has been lost in Christian teaching by obliterating this distinction and losing sight of the person of the offerer as distinct from that of the Priest and victim. It was clearly present to the mind of Our Lord, as we see from such utterances as, " I lay down [My life] of myself : no man taketh it from Me " (St. John x. 18), or " The Son of Man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many " (St. Mark x. 45) ; the words are spoken from the standpoint of the offerer rather than of the Priest. Our understanding of the moral and spiritual grandeur of the Passion suffers a serious loss if we look upon Our Lord solely as the patient Sufferer and forget that it was He Who ordained the Passion, Who was also ordering and arranging its details, the manner, the means, the time of His death. But still more has the doctrine of Sacrifice and its interpretation in the Epistle to the Hebrews suffered from this omission of the person of the offerer. It is this in particular which has led to a serious confusion of thought between the Sacrifice

on the Cross and the Priestly Offering in Heaven.[1] It is well, then, that attention should be drawn at the outset to the importance of the person and work of the offerer in the Jewish Sacrifices.

When we come to the consideration of the ceremonial acts in detail we notice that the agents in the first three acts are the offerer and the victim. The Priest takes up the action with the fourth and fifth acts, during which the offerer takes no further part except in the Peace Offering.

(1). The offerer presented the victim before the Priest in the Fore-court of the Temple. The word technically used for this presentation is *hiqrib* (Lev. i. 3) (*lit.* "to bring near"; R.V. "to offer"). The same word is also used of the Priest's work in presenting the blood (e.g. Lev. i. 5) and the flesh (e.g. i. 13) of the victim upon the altar. The Priest examined the victim to see that it was free from any blemish.[2]

(2). The *laying on of hands* was the work of the offerer. He was required (Lev. i. 4, etc.) to "lay [better, "lean," "rest," denoting pressure] his hand on the head" of his victim. For this act the technical word is *samak* (*lit.*, "to lean upon," e.g. Amos. v. 19, and "leaned his hand on the wall"). This ceremonial laying on of hands was not confined in the Old Testament to the Sacrifices: a complete list of its various uses is given in a note communicated by Dr. Driver on the subject to the conference summoned by Dr. Sanday on "Priesthood and Sacrifice."[3] One idea which seems common to all of these uses is the

[1] See p. 137.
[2] See Philo, "De Victimis," c. 2.
[3] See pp. 39 and 40 of the Report published by Dr. Sanday.

intention of conferring on another something which either belongs to the person who performs the act or is in his power to bestow. The meaning in the case of the Sacrifices seems to be clearly explained in Num. viii. 10, 16, 18, where the congregation present the Levites before the Lord and lay their hands upon them. Aaron then offers them "before the Lord for a *wave Offering on behalf of the children of Israel.*" The ceremonial follows as far as is possible the ordinary course of Sacrifice. The Levites are to represent the whole nation in the service of the Tabernacle. The people, as sacrificers, "offer" them to the Lord instead of themselves, and the laying on of hands empowers them to stand for their people. So in general the laying on of hands in Sacrifice signifies the sacrificer's bestowing upon the victim the power to represent himself—so, e.g., Lev. i. 4: "He shall lay his hand upon the head of the Burnt Offering and *it shall be accepted for him* to make atonement *for him.*" (This is the more significant following upon the words "that he may be accepted before the Lord.") [1] What the victim does and suffers is then representatively the action and suffering of the sacrificer.

We cannot leave this subject without reference to the ceremony with the scapegoat on the Day of

[1] Dr. Swete (Hastings, D. B., III, 85, "Laying on of Hands") accepts the same interpretation of this ceremony in the sacrifices: "The offerer solemnly identified himself with the victim." Robertson Smith ("Semites," p. 423) explains the significance by the primitive idea that "physical contact between the parties serves to identify them." If the ceremony dates from primitive Semitic religion it is interesting to connect it with the primitive idea that the victim (the tribal totem animal) is of the same kin as the sacrificer; the blood relationship gives him the right to make the victim his proxy.

Atonement. Lev. xvi. 21, orders that "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel . . . and shall put them upon the head of the goat." The action in this case is explained as the means of transferring sins; and it has been held that this was the significance of the laying on of hands in the Sacrifices. The sins were laid upon the victim, whose death was their punishment. But it must be noted that the scapegoat was *not* a sacrificial victim. Its fellow had already been offered as a Sin Offering with the proper ceremonies.[1]

3. The *slaughtering*. Another technical term is found for the slaying of the victim. Three Hebrew words are used for the English "to kill." The word *harag* is used almost entirely of killing human beings and never of the sacrificial slaughtering. *Zebaḥ*, which in the earliest times gave the name to the class of animal Sacrifices (*zebaḥ*), was always used rather of the whole group of actions included in a Sacrifice in the sense in which we should say "to *offer* a Sacrifice," and never seems really to have been confined in its meaning to the act of killing, which it properly denotes. For the act of slaughtering a Sacrifice the technical word in the Priestly Code is *shaḥat*, a word occasionally used in earlier times of killing men, but after the Exile confined to the sacrificial slaughter of animals.

The chief point of importance in regard to this act is that it was performed by the sacrificer. In the Priestly Code this is definitely enjoined in the Peace Offering (Lev. iii. 2) and the Sin Offering (Lev. iv. 29,

[1] See p. 96.

33, etc.), and is probably taken for granted in the Burnt Offering (Lev. i. 5) even if the verb here be impersonal,[1] "one shall kill." That this was the normal rule is implied by 2 Chron. xxx. 16, 17, where an exception seems to call for explanation. In the public Offerings for the whole nation the victim might be slain by the Levites (e.g. Ezek. xliv. 11)[2] or the Priests (as, e.g., on the Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 15), but clearly as representing the sacrificers, and not *qua* Priests or Levites. It may be taken for certain that the acknowledged rule at all periods was for the sacrificer to slay the victim ;[3] and there was felt to be an appropriateness in this, as the victim was recognized to be in closest relationship with the offerer and even identified with him. The "killing," in this light, appears as a symbol of self-immolation, the voluntary laying down of one's own life, which is essential to the idea of perfect Sacrifice. But more of this later on ; only we may note once more in passing, how the seeming accidents of the early Sacrifices appear in time to have had a significance undreamt of at first. A Mind is at work guiding all things with an eye on the distant future, as a mother guides her child, looking forward to the day when he will be a man and understand what he now does unthinkingly and almost unconsciously.

[1] See Driver, Leviticus (*ad loc.*).

[2] Moore ("Encyc. Bib.," IV, 4199, art. "Sacrifice") takes this message to refer to private Offerings, but describes it as "a very radical departure from immemorial custom," and adds: "This innovation, however, did not prevail."

[3] The only exceptions (apart from the one mentioned in the text above) I have found are the Sacrifices offered at the consecration of Aaron (Ex. xxix. 11, 20 ; *cf.* Lev. viii. 15, 19), and the Sin Offering of a pigeon (Lev. v. 8). In these cases the special circumstances offer a ready explanation why the sacrificer is not the slaughterer.

Except for the rule just mentioned hardly any regulations are given as to the manner or means of the slaughtering. In the Burnt and Guilt and Sin Offerings the victim was killed "before the Lord" (Lev. i. 5, iv. 4, etc., vi. 25, vii. 2). The same expression in 1 Sam. xv. 33; 2 Sam. xxi. 9 is possibly an allusion to the Burnt Offering at an earlier time, if the slaying of Agag and of Saul's sons was semi-sacrificial. This expression may mean no more than the corresponding injunction "at the door of the Tent of Meeting" in the case of the Peace Offering (Lev. iii. 2, 8, 13), but possibly there may be a significance in confining it to the greater atoning Sacrifices, as if in their case the necessity of death satisfied some stern decree of God, Who is called in to witness its execution (*cf.* Heb. ix. 22).

In the primitive Sacrifices it appears that the victim was slaughtered actually upon the altar itself so that the blood should fall directly on the sacred stone or mound of stones or earth (Exod. xx. 24, 25; *cf.* 2 Kings v. 17) of which the altar was composed. This ancient custom is implied in the Hebrew name for altar *mizbeah* = "the place of slaughtering." It was in use long afterwards amongst the Arabs [1] and references to it are found in the Old Testament (see especially Gen. xxii. 9, and *cf.* 1 Sam. xiv. 34).[2] But long before the dawn of the Old Testament revelation the victim was slaughtered not upon, but by the side of the altar, which was then used for the application of

[1] Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," p. 338.

[2] The passage in Ps. cxviii. 27, "Bind the Sacrifice with cords even unto the horns of the altar," is very obscure, and probably there is some corruption in the text. It cannot be quoted as a reference to the custom of slaughtering at or upon the altar.

the blood and the burning of the flesh. But the original name *mizbeaḥ* was retained long after its meaning ceased to have any appropriateness ; indeed, so much so, that the name was applied even to the table of Shewbread (Ezek. xli. 22) and the Altar of Incense which had no connexion whatever with the slaughtering.

This comparative absence of regulation is not without its negative importance in the interpretation of the sacrificial symbolism. Coupled with this is the further fact that the different kinds of Sacrifice were not marked by any difference in the ceremonial of the slaughter. Attention was not concentrated upon the death, as such, however necessary it might be, but upon the ceremonial acts following after the death. Up to this point we have seen no differences of any importance between the different classes of Sacrifice. It is in the last two acts that these differences occur, and this fact is significant as showing that in them, and not in the first three acts, lies the centre of gravity in the drama of Sacrifice. Whatever may have been the case in prehistoric Sacrifice—whether the oldest word for Sacrifice, *zebaḥ* (= "slaughtering"), implies, or not, a time when the killing was regarded as the central act—at any rate in the Old Testament this was not so. The ceremonial directed the mind of the worshipper past the death of the victim to something beyond, viz. what was done with its blood and its carcass. Let us turn now to these acts.

(4). *The use made of the blood.* We must first notice certain facts about the meaning and significance of the blood. There is a striking unanimity in this

regard amongst primitive races of all countries and ages. The blood is the seed of life; more than this, to the Semite it was *the actual life itself*. Not only does the "life [soul] of the flesh" reside "in the blood" (Lev. xvii. 11) as a spiritual principle embodied in a material, the blood and the life (soul) are one and the same thing: "The blood is the life" (Deut. xii. 23; Gen. ix. 4).[1] It is not too much to say that the Hebrews regarded the life-blood almost as a living thing inside the body which it quickened; and not only was it the vitalizing life while it pulsated within the body, but it had an independent life of its own, even when taken from the body. That it was still alive when it left the body, and continued to live, was the justification for its use in Sacrifice and the secret of its power and efficacy. "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you *upon the altar* to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." It is because the *blood is still alive* after being drawn from the victim's body that it makes atonement upon the altar.[2] It is not merely a figure of speech when Cain is told, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto Me from the ground," and when we read of the "blood of sprinkling" which "*speaketh* better than [? that of] Abel" (Heb. xii. 24).[3] To us moderns blood, and particularly blood that has been shed, brings up the

[1] This belief and its theological consequences are worked out in the well-known excursus of Dr. Westcott in his "Commentary on the Epistles of St. John" (additional note on 1 John i. 7).

[2] See W. Milligan, "Resurrection of Our Lord," pp. 137–138.

[3] The Greek of this passage runs, "speaketh better things than Abel" (speaketh), and the allusion is to Abel's sacrifice, by which "he being dead yet speaketh," not to Abel's blood.

associations of death ; to the Hebrews it meant life that has passed indeed through the experience of death, but has not itself been killed by that experience : it still lives. We can hardly draw attention too emphatically to this radical difference between the modern western mind and the ancient Semitic associations of thought, running down, as they do, through Hebrew and Jewish religion into Christianity and colouring so much of primitive Christian theology and its expression.

Bearing in mind these ideas attached to the sacrificial blood, we may trace the various ways in which it was employed at different times. Perhaps at the earliest stage the victim's blood was all drunk by the worshippers. This would be the case where the victim was identified with the god and men partook in this way of the divine life-blood : they " ate their god." When a distinction was drawn between the god and the victim, the blood was divided—part was drunk by the worshippers and part poured for the god into a pit in the ground or upon a sacred stone ; in this way, by partaking of a common " life," the original kinship between the god and his people was renewed from time to time. At a further stage came the time when men shrank from using " blood " as a food ; this may have been partly due to physical disgust at the idea, but it rested also on some vague spiritual idea of the mystery of life and awe of the life-blood, even of a beast, as a thing too sacred for human food. Blood is an awe-inspiring, even terror-striking thing. It has a mysterious potency and efficacy. Then, when the blood was no longer eaten it

was on occasions poured or sprinkled on persons or things, and the same idea of consecration by sharing with God in a common sacred life is preserved. The very touch of blood makes a thing or person "holy." This supernatural life, which has come direct from the creative hand of God and is employed to reunite man and God, consecrates whatever comes into contact with it, and the person or thing made "holy" by its touch is to be separated from profane or common use. By the double process of consecration[1] he, or it, was at the same time "purified" from previous uncleanness; so, e.g., the house and all who dwelt in it, by the blood on the doorpost (Exod. xii. 23); the Tabernacle and its furniture being polluted by the sins of the people are cleansed by the blood (Exod. xxix. 36; Lev. xvi. 16, 18, 19; *cf.* Heb. ix. 20: the leper on his recovery is cleansed by blood (Lev. xiv. 14, 25). In these cases the prominent thought is the cleansing power of the hallowing blood; "according to the Law, I may almost say all things are cleansed with blood" (Heb. ix. 22). It is with the same association of ideas that by its touch the "Blood" of Jesus "sprinkled" on the heart (Heb. x. 22; *cf.* xii. 24) or the conscience (Heb. ix. 14) cleanses the believer from all sin (*cf.* 1 John i. 7). The same thought of the "cleansing" power of blood underlies its use for the consecration of the High Priest to his office (Exod. xxix. 20) or of a new altar for Ezekiel's Temple (Ezek. xliii. 20; *cf.* 26), or of the nation of Israel to be the "holy" people (Exod. xxiv. 8, xix. 6; Lev. xx. 26; *cf.* Heb. ix. 19 ff.).

[1] See p. 49.

In this last instance a "kinship" is created, as if by "commensality," between the altar (representing God), the Covenant-Book and the people by sharing together a common life-blood, and by that "kinship" with God Israel is consecrated to be a people "holy unto the Lord." This brings us back from our digression on the consecrating power of blood to the point from which we set out. If this is the general significance of blood, how are we to interpret its use in the altar transaction of Sacrifice? On the Day of Atonement one, if not the chief, of its functions was to cleanse and reconsecrate the Tabernacle and the furniture of worship (see p. 94 f.). But it is clear that this was not the case in the ordinary public and private Sacrifices; there is no hint that every Offering of blood on the altar was in order to reconsecrate it after pollution. Bearing in mind, besides the primary truth that the blood is the soul or the life, two other facts: (1) that by the laying on of hands the victim is identified with the person of the offerer, and (2) that the altar is the "Table of the Lord" on which men present their gifts to God, we arrive at a fairly certain interpretation of this part of the ceremonial. *The presentation of the blood on the altar signifies the offering of the sacrificer's own life to God.* The blood is *offered, presented,* to God (Lev. i. 5, of the Burnt Offering; Lev. vii. 33, of the Peace Offering; Heb. ix. 7, of the Sin Offering). This idea of a gift to God is also present in the great Sin Offering of the Day of Atonement (see Heb. ix. 7). Two apparently distinct uses of the blood appear then in the Levitical system: (1) as a means of con-

secration (see above), and (2) as an offering to God. The Day of Atonement combines the two.

The ceremonial use of the blood did not vary in the Burnt, Peace, and Trespass Offerings. The blood was caught in a bowl as it left the victim's body and was handed at once either by the offerer or by an attendant Levite (2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxv. 11) to the officiating Priest, who "poured" or "dashed" it on the altar. The technical word for this act is *zaraq*. The verb means "*to toss or throw in a volume*," [1] and there is no doubt that it corresponds to our word "pour." Further proof of this, if necessary, is seen in the derivative noun *mizroq* (= a "bowl" or "basin"). The verb should always be translated in English by "pour" or some equivalent word. The A.V. rendering "sprinkle," which is retained in the R.V. (e.g. Exod. xxiv. 6, 8, to mention one of the most prominent instances), is a mis-translation, and pregnant also with serious consequences. There was *one Sacrifice, and one only, to which the act of "sprinkling" the blood properly belonged*, i.e., the Sin Offering on the Day of Atonement.[2] It would follow that in the New Testament wherever reference is made to "the sprinkling" of the Blood of Jesus (e.g. Heb. xii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 2), the allusion is not to the old Sacrifices in general, but to this particular one. But in the New Testament, also, the issue is confused to the English reader, because the revisers have translated the Greek προσχεῖν, πρόσχυσις (= *zaraq*) by "sprinkling" (Heb. xi. 28), in reference to the Passover, a Sacrifice belonging to the class of Peace Offerings. The proper equivalents

[1] Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon, s.v. [2] See p. 89.

of "sprinkling" (ῥαντίζειν, ῥαντισμός) are found in Heb. xii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 2. But there is one passage where the Greek as well fails to observe the distinction, viz. Heb. ix. 19, 21, which translates the Hebrew *zaraq* (= "pour") of Exod. xxiv. 6, 8 by ῥαντίζειν, and therefore justifies the English translators in this particular passage in using the word "sprinkled." The use of ῥαντίζειν in these two verses is the more striking because the LXX, which the Epistle generally follows,[1] observes faithfully the distinctions of the Hebrew terminology and translates *zaraq* of Exod. xxiv. 6, 8 by προσέχεεν (verse 6) and κατεσκέδασεν (verse 8). This version consistently translates *zaraq* by προσχεῖν —the only exceptions being the κατεσκέδασεν of Exod. xxiv. 8 and the solitary use of ῥαινειν in Ezek. xxxvi. 25 (= *Heb. zaraq*). Correspondingly, for the "sprinkling" proper the word ῥαινειν and its compounds are regularly used by the LXX. It is remarkable then that the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the face not only of the Hebrew (with which the author was probably unacquainted),[2] but also of the LXX (the version of the Old Testament almost certainly used by him), should change the word to "sprinkling" in Chap. ix. 19, 21. A little further study of the passage suggests strongly that the change was intentional. A remarkable feature of this chapter is the apparent confusion of the annual Sin Offering on the Day of Atonement with the original inauguration Sacrifice described in Exod. xxiv. 1–11. In verses 7–12 and 24, 25 the author is thinking of the Day of Atonement; verses 15–21 refer to Exod. 24; and in

[1] See Westcott, "Epistle to Hebrews," pp. 476 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 479.

verses 22 and 23 he has both occasions in view. The link between the two Sacrifices is that suggested above —namely the use in both of the blood as a means of cleansing and consecrating. The Day of Atonement was an annual renewal of the inauguration Sacrifice of Exod. xxiv, and it is doubtless this identity which led the Epistle to the Hebrews to alter "pouring" to "sprinkling" in Chapter ix. 19, 21. If this is the true explanation, the "blood of sprinkling" is meant to refer to both events, the inauguration (Exod. xxiv.) and the yearly renewal of the Old Covenant (Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi.), but not to any of the ordinary Offerings (Burnt, Peace, Trespass, or Sin).

In the Sin Offering the ceremonial use of the blood was as follows :—

On receiving the blood in the bowl the Priest dipped his fingers in it and *smeared* (E.V. "put") the blood on the Horns of the Altar. The word used for this action is *nathan* = "to give" (in its widest sense) or "put." This very ordinary word becomes a technical term in the ceremonial of the Sin Offering, and is consistently used as such (see, for example, Lev. iv. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34). Of course only a very small quantity of the blood could be used in this way, and so the direction continues "All the blood . . . shall he pour out at the base of the altar" (Lev. iv. 7, etc.). We should note that the word for "pour" in this case is not the technical *zaraq* but *shaphak*, a general and non-technical word, which marks the fact that this pouring was not a part of the sacrificial ceremony, but only a means for disposing of the rest of the blood. It is to be noticed also that this pouring was not upon

the *altar*, but upon the *ground* beside the altar. The sacrificial and significant ceremony is the " putting " of the blood upon the *Horns* of the Altar. These were the most sacred part of the altar (see 1 Kings i. 50 ; Amos iii. 14). They were made of a piece with the altar (Exod. xxvii. 2), even as the altar itself was originally intended to be of a piece with the earth, being a raised mound either of earth (Exod. xx. 24 ; 2 Kings v. 17), or of unhewn stones (Exod. xx. 25). An artificial altar of hewn stone or of metal, such as Solomon's brazen altar, could only be regarded as placed upon the earth, not as forming a part of it, and therefore Solomon's altar was replaced by one of unhewn stones by Maccabeus (1 Macc. iv. 47). The altar was, in fact, a representation in miniature of a " high place." Naturally, then, the highest part of the altar was the most sacred part. Further, this part was made into the shape of horns. Possibly in its prehistoric origin this may have arisen from a custom of draping the altar stone with the skin of the victim,[1] but in the historical period there is little doubt that quite different ideas were associated with the Horns of the Altar. The word " horn " was used figuratively by the Hebrews in two different but closely related ways. On the living animal, ox or ram, the horns were the seat of its strength—*vim cornibus addit.* So the word is very commonly used for strength, power, confidence : " Lift not up your horn on high " (Ps. lxxv. 5) ; " all the horns of the wicked also will I cut off : but the horns of the righteous shall be lifted up " (*ib.* 10 ; *cf.* Ps. lxxxix. 17, 24, and often).

[1] See Robertson Smith, " Religion of the Semites," p. 436.

The horn of the dead beast was used as an oil flask (e.g. 1 Sam. xvi. 1), and probably (though we have no direct evidence) as a drinking cup, from which came its figurative use of "abundance" (*cf.* "cornucopia"). Both uses suggested the appropriateness of the horn-shape for the most sacred part of the altar, and to these may have been added the use of "horn" for a hill (e.g. Is. v. 2; see R.V. margin). It is quite possible that, as with the belief in the sacredness of hilltops and high places, so here, the thought of the horns being the highest part of the altar, and therefore nearest to heaven, had something to do with the special reverence attached to them; but in any case they represented a closer spiritual nearness to God. The blood is, then, brought nearer to God in the Sin Offering than in the other Offerings.

The same thought is continued in a higher degree in the higher Sin Offerings. For the layman the blood was "put" on the Horns of the Altar of Burnt Offering, which stood in the Court before the Tabernacle (Lev. iv. 18, 25, 30, 34). For the "anointed Priest" the blood was "put" on the Horns of the Golden Altar of Incense in the Holy Place (Lev. iv. 7), to which the Priests were admitted in their daily ministrations (Heb. ix. 6), but the laity were excluded. Lastly, on one occasion in the year, viz. the Day of Atonement, when atonement was made by a Sin Offering for the High Priest, the Priesthood, and the whole nation, the blood was "sprinkled" (for explanation of this term see p. 89) on the Mercy Seat, above which rested the manifested Presence of God himself (Lev. xvi. 2, 14, 15). In each case the sinner was

restored to that particular degree of "nearness" to God which belongs to him by right of his rank in the congregation.[1]

(5). *The use of the flesh.* We saw above (p. 66) that in early Semitic heathenism the victim was slaughtered actually upon the sacrificial stone or mound, and this is implied in the very name for altar, *mizbeaḥ* (= "place of slaughtering"). From the first, however, the slaughtering upon the altar was for the sake of convenience rather than an essential feature of Sacrifice. What was essential was that the living blood should fall upon the altar and the easiest way to do this was to kill the victim upon the altar. These early altars were just low mounds. But when the practice arose of burning part or whole of the carcass the altars were made higher and more convenient for this purpose and then the victim was slaughtered by the side of the altar, and the altar itself became solely the place of offering to the god the blood and the flesh which was his portion in the Sacrifice. In primitive heathenism the god may have been supposed to consume his share in human fashion; such an idea is mentioned and forbidden to the Israelites in Ps. l. 13: "Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?" But though purged of its grossness the idea still remains that God does receive and use what is offered to Him upon the altar—so the flesh and blood are called His "bread" or His "food" (Ezek. xliv. 7; Lev. iii. 11, xxi. 6, 8, etc., xxii. 25; Num. xxviii. 2; Mal. i. 7, 12). The word for arranging the different pieces of meat upon the altar, *arak*, is the same as

[1] See further, p. 114.

that used for laying and furnishing a table. Lastly, the altar itself is called the "Table of the Lord" (Mal. i. 7, 12); and, as showing that the terms are interchangeable, the "Table of Shewbread" is called in Ezek. xli. 22 an "altar." The reader will not need to be reminded that this term, the "Table of the Lord," was taken over into Christian usage (1 Cor. x. 21). But attention may well be drawn to the meaning attaching to the phrase from its Jewish associations. St. Paul has just said that the Israelites "which eat the sacrifices" have "communion with the altar" (1 Cor. x. 18); in like manner we who partake of the Body and Blood of Christ partake of the "Table of the Lord," from which, like the Priests under the Old Covenant, we are fed by the "portions" sent by Him to us (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 13). Conversely (Heb. xiii. 10) we are fed from "an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle." It is plain that in Christian as in Jewish usage "altar" and "table" are the same, and therefore in both the primary idea attached to the "Table of the Lord" is that of an altar on which man's Offering to the Lord (the body and blood of the victim) is laid, and from which the Lord sends "portions" to His Priests.

It will be seen by the Table of Ceremonial[1] that in the *Burnt Offering* the whole carcass (i.e. all the parts considered fit for food) were given to God on the altar; in the other three Sacrifices the fat alone was offered. In the Trespass and Sin Offerings the rest of the flesh belonged to the Priests and was eaten by them; in the Peace Offering the Priest had his portions,

[1] See p. 60.

the *heave-thigh* and the *wave-breast*, and the rest was then eaten by the sacrificer and his friends.[1] Thus in all cases the *fat* at least was reserved as God's portion. The Israelites were forbidden to eat the fat of any sacrificial animal (Lev. vii. 23). The parallel between this prohibition and that of eating blood (Lev. vii. 26) may point to a similar belief connecting the fat with the life of the animal. It is possible that the practice of anointing in consecrating a man to an office may have originated from some such belief; anointing with the fat, like sprinkling with the blood, may have been regarded as making a person "holy."[2] But this to a great extent is a matter of conjecture, and it is a sufficient explanation that the fat was regarded as the choicest part of the flesh (*cf.* the metaphorical use in Gen. xlv. 18; Num. xviii. 12; see R.V., margin), and therefore set apart as sacred to God.

The "portion of Jehovah" was conveyed to Him by being burnt in the fire of the altar. The technical word for this action is again full of significance. This word, *hiqtir*, means literally "to cause to go up in sweet smoke"; so this altar-burning is "for a sweet savour unto the Lord" (Lev. iv. 31). The verb and its kindred noun *qetoreth* (sweet smoke) are used *only* of sacrificial burning and sacrificial smoke (which includes also the smoke of incense).[3] It is evidently meant that the effect of the sacrificial fire upon the Offering was to refine and etherialize what is carnal and earthly; the gross flesh, changed into the sweet smoke, ascends heavenwards, until it reaches the

[1] See p. 37.
[2] *Cf.* Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," p. 383.
[3] See p. 27.

heavenly realms. It is significant also that while *hiqtir* is used only in sacrificial language, the word *saraph* (= "to burn up"), the ordinary secular word for *destructive* burning, is never used of the portions burnt upon the altar, although, in pointed contrast with the sacrificial *hiqtir*, it is used of consuming the portions which were not burnt on the altar. *Cf.* Lev. xvi. 25 ("The fat . . . he shall burn [*hiqtir*] on the altar") with verse 27 ("they shall burn [*saraph*] in the fire," i.e. a fire lit "without the camp," their skins, etc.); the same distinction is observed also in Lev. iv. 10, 12, 19, 21, vii. 5, 17, ix. 10, 11. For the use of *saraph* in connexion with parts of the flesh not burnt on the altar, see also Lev. vi. 30, x. 16. From these passages it is clear that the burning upon the altar is to be interpreted very differently from the destructive burning of the useless and rejected portions of the flesh. The fire on the altar was a sacred fire. It came down from Heaven in the first instance on Aaron's first sacrifice (Lev. ix. 24), and it was never allowed to go out (Lev. vi. 12, 13). God signified His acceptance of Elijah's Offering by sending down fire from Heaven to burn it (1 Kings xviii. 38). It is plain, then, that of the two purposes of fire—to refine and to destroy—the former is its use in Sacrifice. The fire purifies the gift and makes it an offering of "sweet savour" (Gen. viii. 21; Exod. xxix. 41; Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, viii. 21, 28; *cf.* Lev. xxvi. 31; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19 mg.; Amos v. 21 mg.), and the burning is a token of God's pleasure in accepting the gift. This is true not only of the Peace and Burnt Offerings, but of the Sin Offering also (Lev. iv. 31), and it quite negatives any

idea of a penal altar fire destroying a sin-bearing victim. The bearing of this fact on the whole conception of the meaning and purpose of Sacrifice will be seen later on. It is interesting to note that the expression "Fire Offering" (= "an offering made by fire") became so technical that it could be applied to Offerings which were not burnt on the fire at all, such as the Shewbread, which was eaten by the Priests (Lev. xxiv. 7, 9; *cf.* Deut. xviii. 1; Josh. xiii. 14; 1 Sam. ii. 28). The figure is carried still further in the New Testament, where Our Lord's self-oblation is called "an odour of a sweet smell" (Eph. v. 2; *cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 15), and the gift made to him by his converts is described by St. Paul as "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18). On the expression "salted by fire" see above, p. 26.

So far we have seen what was done with the parts of the flesh offered to God and with the refuse or offal. We have still to treat of the portions assigned to the Priest and to the offerer. In the Peace Offering both Priest and offerer had their portion, and the sacred tie of hospitality and of commensality (nourishment by the same food) bound together all three parties—God and the offerer and the Priest, who represents each to the other.[1] In the Sin and Trespass Offerings the Priest's portion included all except the fat, which was offered to God (Lev. vi. 26 ff.; vii. 6 f.); the offerer received no portion. In these Sacrifices, as well as in the *minḥah* it is clear from Lev. vi. 17, 18 that the Priest receives his portion as the representative

[1] See above, p. 38.

of God. All that is not kept and eaten by the offerer (i.e. the whole of the flesh except in the Peace Offering) is made over to God, who accepts it in part directly through the altar fire and in part indirectly in the person of His Priest. It follows that when the Sin or Trespass Offering was made by a Priest for himself or on behalf of the whole congregation, including himself, there was no one to eat the rest of the flesh after the fat was burned ; and in this case the remainder was burnt (*saraph*)—not a sacrificial but a destructive burning outside the camp (Lev. iv. 12, 21, viii. 17, ix. 11, xvi. 27). In Lev. x. 16 the Sin Offering of the people (see Lev. ix. 3, 15) is distinct from Aaron's own Sin Offering (Lev. ix. 8–11), and in that case Aaron and his sons should have received their portion and eaten it within the sanctuary ; it is noted as an irregularity that instead it had been burnt without the camp. The meaning of this part of the ceremonial of the Sin and Trespass Offerings seems fairly certain. In these penitential Sacrifices there is a common meal in which God and His Priest share, but the sacrificer, as a mark of penitence and mourning, is required to abstain from the feast. In the Peace Offering the ceremonial indicates that the sacrificer is the host who calls God to be his guest at the feast ; but the "waving" (and possibly also the "heaving") shows that God returns a part to the Priest, who thus becomes God's guest directly, and indirectly the guest of the sacrificer (Lev. vii. 34 ; see p. 38).

CHAPTER IV

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

(For the name see Lev. xxiii 27, 28, xxv. 9)

THE regulations for the Day of Atonement are contained in Lev. xvi. Certain other passages (Lev. xxiii. 26–32; Num. xxix. 7–11) add practically nothing to Lev. xvi; but Exod. xxx. 10, incidentally supplies a not unimportant detail omitted in this chapter. The observance of the Day is probably not earlier than the Exile. The first we find of anything like it is in theVision-Legislation of Ezekiel (xlv. 18 ff.). On the first or seventh day of the first month (or as the LXX, perhaps with better authority, reads: "On the first day of the seventh month, i.e. the month Tisri, in which the Levitical Day of Atonement was kept) a Sin Offering is ordered "to cleanse the sanctuary" or "make atonement for the house" (= the Temple) "for every one that erreth and for him that is sinful." The "cleansing" and the making "atonement" for the furniture of worship (the altar, the Temple, etc.) was a feature of the original consecration of the altar (Ezek. xliii. 20, 22, 26), when from being "common or unclean" (i.e. ordinary and secular in use and associations) it was consecrated (i.e. set apart as "holy to the Lord"). From Ezek. xlv. we see

that its contact with an erring and sinful people was held to pollute it, so that each year it needed a new consecration. The same Sin Offering which was made for the sins of the people (Ezek. xlv. 20) served also to reconsecrate the sanctuary. This throws a new light on the purpose of the Day of Atonement in the later Priestly Legislation. Here also we see the same connexion between the people and the sanctuary: the people's sins pollute their sacred places, and the making of atonement is needed not only for the people but for sanctuary and altar also as at their original consecration (Exod. xxix. 36 f.). The hallowing of these by the touch of the sacrificial blood (to "cleanse" and "make atonement for" them) is like a new consecration each year. At the same time the blood sprinkled on the holy places as a Sin Offering for the sins of the people and their Priests made atonement for them also. Further, although the blood was not sprinkled on the people or Priests (*cf.* Exod. xxiv. 8), yet we see from Heb. ix. that the nation as well as its altars and sanctuary was *reconsecrated* each year on the Day of Atonement. This explains the apparent confusion of the references in Heb. ix. to the Day of Atonement (in verses 9–12, 22, 24) and the original consecrating Covenant Sacrifice of Exod. xxiv. in vv. 15–20. Every year the Covenant was in some sort renewed, the sanctuary and its furniture were rededicated with blood, and by its own consecrating touch the altar rededicated the Priesthood and the people who worshipped at it. We have to remember, also, that the blood of these Sin Offerings was identified with the "life" of those who offered

them (i.e. Priests and people) ; so that while, *as blood*, it exercised its cleansing effect and rededicated the sanctuary, at the same time, as representing the offerers, it received from the altar its own rededication.

Before describing the ceremonial of the Day two things deserve to be noted about it : First, it was the only penitential Day ordered in the Law. " Ye shall afflict your souls and shall do no manner of work . . . it is a Sabbath of solemn rest unto you " (Lev. xvi. 29). It was " *the* Fast " (Acts xxvii. 9). Secondly, the Sin Offerings of this Day were not merely the highest in importance of all the atoning Sacrifices : they summed up all the atoning power of the others. It is repeated again and again that *all* the sins of the nation are included under the atonement made on this Day (Lev. xvi. 16, 21, 22, 30, 34). It has been thought[1] that this repeated " all " would include the greater moral sins which we saw were not covered by the ordinary Sin Offerings (p. 57). But this is doubtful in itself, since it would be a reversal of the general principle of atonement by Sacrifice ; and the offences are described in Heb. ix. 7 as ἀγνοήματα (" errors," i.e. "sins of ignorance "), which makes it clear that, as generally understood by the Jews, there was no difference in principle between the Sacrifices on the Day of Atonement and other Sin Offerings. The fact remains, however, that these Sacrifices summed up and included all the atonement for sin that could be made by means of Sacrifice under the Old Covenant. It is for this reason that the New Testament generally, and the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular, referring

[1] Dale, " Jewish Temple," p. 287.

to the atoning Sacrifice of Christ, speak of the "sprinkling" of the blood, which was peculiar to the Day of Atonement.[1] It is important to remember that the Day of Atonement is the "type" which is seen by the Christian inspired writers to be fulfilled by the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension.

THE CEREMONIAL OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

The occasion given in Lev. xvi. for the institution of this day is important in its bearing upon the meaning and purpose of its Sacrifices. Aaron's sons, Nadab and Abihu, had offered "strange fire" on the Altar of Burnt Incense, and "there came forth fire from before the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it which the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh Me" (Lev. x. 2, 3). This is referred to in Lev. xvi.: "The Lord spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they drew near before the Lord and died. . . . Speak unto Aaron thy brother that he come not at all times into the Holy Place . . . that he die not." The key to the meaning of the Day of Atonement is to be found in the words, "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh Me." The office and work of the Priests was "to draw near" unto the Lord to offer the Sacrifices (Lev. ix. 7, xxi. 17; Num. xvi. 40). This they did every day at the Altar of Burnt Offering in the outer Court, and also at the Altar of Incense in

[1] See pp. 72–76.

the Holy Place (*cf.* Hebrews ix. 6); but on one day in the year, one of their order, the High Priest, was privileged to enter into the more immediate presence of God in the innermost shrine, the Holy of Holies. Here was the "Mercy Seat," the "footstool of the throne of God"; above it rested the "Glory" of the Lord adored by the worshipping Cherubim on either side. This was the most God-filled, most sacred spot on earth: to it even the High Priest might not "draw near" at all times, but only once a year, and then for a very special purpose—to make atonement for all the sins of the nation, to cleanse and hallow both them (especially their Priesthood) and their sanctuary, that they might "draw near" on other occasions as a "sanctified" people. Thus there are two different strands of thought in Lev. xvi.: (1) The warning (drawn from and illustrated by the consequences of Nadab and Abihu's presumption) that the Holy of Holies is not to be entered but upon one day in the year, and (2) the observance of a great culminating act of atonement in the Holy of Holies upon that day. Scholars have found such difficulty in harmonizing the two intentions in this chapter that some have been led to regard them as imperfectly combined from two distinct sources. In any case, however, it is clear from Hebrews ix. that the two were closely united in Jewish thought of the Christian era, for the "entering" as well as the "sprinkling" is there considered as an act of great significance (see verses 7, 11, 24; *cf.* Chapters x. 19, 20, vi. 20). The Christian has the Priestly right of entering at all times within the veil without fear of being presumptuous, because by the

Blood of Jesus his heart has been sprinkled from an evil conscience : he is " sanctified." He may with boldness " enter into the Holy Place " by the Blood of Jesus by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil (Hebrews x. 19), and there " draw near " to offer His Sacrifice.

Bearing in mind these two purposes of the Day of Atonement—(1) the ceremonial " entry " into the Holy of Holies, and (2) the making of atonement for the sins of Priests and people, along with the rededication of the sanctuary—let us now review some of the more significant features of the ceremonial. They may be considered in order under five headings :

(A) The making of atonement for the Priesthood.
(B) The making of atonement for the people.
(C) The making of atonement for the sanctuary and its altars.
(D) The dismissal of the scapegoat.
(E) Completion of the Sacrifices.

The references below are to Lev. xvi. Of that chapter, verses 1–10 give a summary description, which is repeated with more detail in verses 11–28.

(A) *The atonement for the High Priest and his " house," i.e. the Priesthood.*—Having " bathed his flesh in water," the High Priest put on his plain linen vestments (coat, breeches, girdle, and mitre—verse 4) as a token of penitence, leaving off the Ephod, the robe of the Ephod, the Breastplate, and the Crown upon the Mitre, viz. the holy garments " for glory and for beauty," which he wore in his ordinary ministrations (Exod. xxviii). He then took a bullock as a Sin Offering for himself and his house (verses 3 and 6)

and two goats, one of which was selected by lot for the people's Sin Offering, and the other for "*Azazel*" (verses 5, 8, 10); also two rams as Burnt Offerings for himself and the people (according to the regular rule, by which a Sin Offering was always followed by a Burnt Offering, as the token of renewed self-oblation of the purified reconsecrated life). Being himself the sacrificer, the High Priest killed the bullock (verse 11; *cf.* Lev. ix. 8). Taking a censer with live coal from off the Golden Altar of Burnt Incense in the Holy Place, and sprinkling incense upon it, he entered within the veil, holding the censer before him, so that the smoke might rise up between himself and the Mercy Seat "that he die not." Leaving the censer there, he took of the blood of the bullock and "sprinkled" it "with his finger" upon the Mercy Seat on the east, and before the Mercy Seat seven times (verses 12–14), and so made atonement for himself and for his house.

Note :—(1) The incense smoke symbolizes the veil of prayer rising up between the sinner and the presence of God.

(2) The word "sprinkle" is of importance. It denotes a ceremonial act quite distinct from the *putting* or *smearing* of the blood with the finger in the ordinary Sin Offerings or the *pouring* in the other Sacrifices (pp. 72–74). The word here used is *hizzah*, the causative form of the verb "to leap" or "to jump" and meaning therefore "to cause to jump." It is used in Isaiah lii. 15, meaning "to startle, astonish" (see R.V., margin). The A.V. and R.V. translation, "sprinkle many nations," is not justified in this passage, and unfortunately introduces

the thought of sacrificial atonement, which is foreign to the passage, while the idea of astonishment is in full agreement with the context: "Many were astonied at thee . . . kings shall shut their mouths at him." The simple verb "to start" or "leap" is used of blood in 2 Kings ix. 33: "Some of her blood splashed against the wall"; and Isaiah lxiii. 3: "Their life blood is splashed upon my garment." In the *hiphil* (causative) form the sacrificial meaning is "to make to splash," i.e. "to sprinkle." In the Sacrifices this was done by dipping the finger in the bowl full of blood and jerking it so that the blood was sprinkled on the Mercy Seat (Lev. xvi. 14). Comparing *all* the passages in which the "sprinkling" (*hizzah*) of blood is mentioned, we see that except in these great Sin Offerings on the Day of Atonement there was only *one* Sacrifice in which the blood was "sprinkled" upon the altar, and that a minor form of the Trespass or Sin Offering (Lev. v. 9), when a pigeon might be offered by a poor person in place of the more costly victim. In this instance the direction that the blood was to be "sprinkled" was probably for convenience' sake; in any case it certainly does not mark out this form of Sin Offering as *more* important than the others. In all other cases the "sprinkling" of the blood is either upon persons or things, to hallow them (Exod. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 30, xiv. 7, 51); or towards a *more* sacred spot in an ordinary Sin Offering—towards the veil when the blood was put on the Horns of the Altar of Incense in the Sin Offering for the Priest or for the whole congregation (Lev. iv. 6, 17); or *towards* the tent of meeting (Num. xix. 4) in the Sin Offering

(verse 9) of the red heifer. These passages include all the instances of "sprinkling" of blood in Sacrifice. In many other places (notably Exod. xxiv. 6, 8) our E.V. has unfortunately used the word "sprinkle" to translate a quite different word in the Hebrew, viz. *zaraq* (p. 72), and has thereby blurred the emphasis which is thrown upon the Day of Atonement and its Sin Offerings, both in the Old Testament and, what is far more important, in the New Testament.[1] It cannot be too strongly emphasized that it is with the Day of Atonement that Calvary, the Resurrection, and the Ascension are compared in their sacrificial aspect as the making of atonement for the sins of the world.

(3) The Mercy Seat was the spiritual centre of the Tabernacle, which was called the "house of the Mercy Seat" (1 Chron. xxviii. 11). The Hebrew *kapporeth* comes from the same root as the verb *kipper*, which is translated in our English Bible "to make atonement." From the belief[2] that the original meaning (now lost) of this root was "to cover," some scholars maintain that the word simply meant "the covering" or "lid" of the Ark, on the top of which it rested. But nothing is certain about the original meaning of *kaphar*, and the "Mercy Seat" was not a part of the Ark, but a distinct thing laid upon it. The description of it is given in Exod. xxv. 17 ff. Our translation "Mercy Seat" is derived from the metaphorical meaning of *kipper* = "to make atonement," and is supported by the sprinkling of the blood upon it on the Day of Atonement

[1] See p. 72. [2] See p. 100 ff.

"to make atonement" for sin. It is the oldest interpretation of the word that we can trace, appearing in the LXX, ἱλαστήριον, which shows that already in the third century B.C. the Hebrew *kapporeth* was traditionally connected with the cycle of ideas attaching to atonement. The Vulgate has *propitiatorium*. Our English "Mercy Seat" (derived from Luther's *Gnadenstuhl*) is a paraphrase rather than a translation. The proper meaning of *kapporeth* is "that which makes atonement," denoting not the *place*, as implied in the word "Mercy Seat," but the *instrument* of atonement. This is also the proper meaning of the Greek ἱλαστήριον. The Mercy Seat became the means of atonement by virtue of the blood sprinkled upon it, as was the case with the altar in the ordinary Sin Offerings (Lev. xvii. 11). It was, however, a still greater means of atonement—in fact, the greatest of all—because above it and between the wings of the overshadowing Cherubim was the Presence of God (Exod. xxv. 22, xxx. 6; Lev. xvi. 2; Num. vii. 89). It was the offering of the Sacrificial Blood on this, the most sacred spot in the whole earth, where God came nearer than anywhere else to his people, that made the most complete atonement which the Sacrifices of the Old Covenant were able to provide. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 24, 25) the anti-type to this is the entry of Christ "into Heaven itself" now to appear *before the face of God* for us, and this "appearing" is described in the next verse as "offering Himself" upon this Heavenly Mercy Seat as the Jewish High Priest offered "blood not his own" in the Tabernacle (*cf.* verse 7).

For references in the earlier books to the Mercy Seat and its peculiar sanctity as the dwelling-place of God, see 1 Sam. iv. 4 ; 2 Sam. vi. 2. The Mercy Seat was probably lost along with the Ark at the time of the Exile, but the blood was still sprinkled on the spot where the Ark and Mercy Seat would have stood. This was the practice in Our Lord's time (see Josephus "Antiquities" III, x, 3 and the Mishna tract "Yoma"). In this way the original idea was kept alive down to Christian times.

(B) *The atonement for the people.*—After sprinkling the blood of the bullock on the Mercy Seat the High Priest came back to the Court of the Temple, and taking the "goat of the Sin Offering," i.e. the one "on which the lot fell for the Lord" (Lev. xvi. 9), he killed it himself. The proper ceremonial required that this victim, which was the people's Sin Offering, should be killed by someone representing the offerer—the whole nation ; and in this capacity once more and not in his capacity as Priest, the High Priest slaughtered the goat. He then "sprinkled" the blood as before on the Mercy Seat and before it. In this way atonement was made for the people.

(C) *The atonement for the Holy Places.*—The "sprinkling" of the Blood by which atonement was made for the sins of the Priesthood and the people at the same time made atonement for the Holy Place (i.e. the Holy of Holies). A word of explanation seems called for here to answer the very natural question : How could it be needful to make atonement for an altar or any inanimate object ? Does not the very idea of atonement imply responsibility and guilt,

which can attach only to persons? Yet in Lev. xvi. 16 the same sprinkling of the blood, by which the High Priest makes atonement "for himself and his house and all the assembly of Israel," is said to make atonement for the Holy Place. In Exod. xxix. 36 (*cf.* Lev. viii. 15) three effects are mentioned as proceeding from the use of the blood in the Sin Offering at the consecration of an altar—purging (or cleansing or purifying), making atonement, and sanctifying. We have seen that purifying (from previous uncleanness) and hallowing (or sanctifying) were the two complementary processes of consecration. Now Exod. xxix. 36, "Thou shalt cleanse the altar by thy making atonement for it" (R.V., margin), practically identifies the making of atonement with purging (see further, Chapter V on the meaning of "Atonement").[1] The same expressions are combined in our present chapter also (Lev. xvi. 18, 19). The sanctuary has been defiled by the uncleanness of the people and therefore needs cleansing; but also—and here the inanimate altar is almost personified as if it were a responsible being whose guilt incurs Divine disfavour—atonement must be made for it, to restore it to Divine favour. The blood of the Sin Offering effects a change not only in the altar itself (from uncleanness to "holiness") but in the attitude of God towards it (from disfavour to favour). The former is called to cleanse, purge, purify, or hallow; the latter is called making atonement for it. In the same way, but as a separate action, atonement was made for the "tent of meeting," i.e. the first chamber of the Taber-

[1] Esp. p. 113.

nacle (see Lev. xvi. 17, 20), and the Holy Place in particular (verse 16). How this was done is not defined in Lev. xvi., but is mentioned incidentally in Exod. xxx. 10: "And Aaron shall make atonement [i.e. for the Golden Altar of Incense in the Holy Place] upon the horns of it once in the year; with the blood of the Sin Offering of atonement once in the year shall he make atonement for it throughout your generations: it is most holy unto the Lord." The last words are interesting as showing again the close connexion between consecration and atonement. The "holy" altar desecrated by the sins of the Priesthood and people is reconsecrated by the blood of the Sin Offering, which makes atonement for it. . . . Finally, atonement was made for the "altar that is before the Lord," i.e. the great altar of Burnt Offering in the Fore-Court (verse 18), by "putting" of the blood of the bullock and the goat upon its horns and by "sprinkling" (verse 19: the same word *hizzah* as in verse 14, 15) upon it seven times. Note again that the "cleansing" with blood is also a "hallowing" and a "making atonement."

(D) *The dismissal of the scapegoat.*—The only parallel to this in the Levitical Ceremonial Law was in the "law of the leper on the day of his cleansing," and the cleansing of a leprous house (Lev. xiv). In that case one of two birds was killed, and the other, the live one, after being dipped in the blood of the first, was "let go . . . into the open field." So on the Day of Atonement two goats were taken "for a Sin Offering" (xvi. 5); one was chosen by lot for the Lord" and the other "for *Azazel*." This second goat, the "Goat for *Azazel*," is familiar to us from the A.V.

as the "scapegoat" (= the "escape-goat," the goat that was "let go in the wilderness"). An odd feature in the history of the English term "scapegoat" is the way in which its original meaning has been exactly reversed. In common usage it has come to mean not the one who escapes a punishment, but the innocent party who is substituted for the guilty and bears the penalty of another's crime. This description would apply to the goat that was offered for a Sin Offering rather than the "scapegoat." The meaning of the latter, and his rôle in the ceremonial of the Day, is clear. Atonement has already been made for the sins of Priests and people by the sprinkling of the blood upon the Mercy Seat (verse 17) before the scapegoat enters on his part of the ceremony. The sins are already forgiven for which Aaron laying his hands upon the head of the "Goat for *Azazel*" confesses "all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions, even all their sins," "putting them upon the head of the goat." (The laying on of hands in this connexion undoubtedly signifies the transferring of sin, although its meaning in the ceremonial of ordinary Sacrifices was a different one.[1] Bearing the sins of the people, the scapegoat was led into the wilderness (by the hand of a man that is in readiness), and there in "a solitary land" he was set free (verse 21, 22). The spiritual meaning is very beautiful and is often found in the Old Testament. Man needs not only that his sin should be forgiven, but also that the sin itself and its entail—the trammelling consequences, the shameful and paralysing remem-

[1] See page 64.

brance of it[1]—should be taken away out of his life. The removal of forgiven sin, sending it right away where it can no longer lay its hand upon us again, but is excommunicated, banished to a solitary land where no man dwells—that is the truth symbolized by this part of the ceremony. The same thought with regard to the physical uncleanness of leprosy is set forth by the dipping of the live bird in the blood of the other and letting him go into the open field." The leprosy from which the leper is cleansed by the blood of the first bird is carried by the living bird far away where it can do no more harm. Parallels may be found in Ps. ciii. 12: "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us;" in Mic. vii. 19: "Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea"; and most vividly in the vision of Zech. v. 5–12, where the woman called "Wickedness" is carried away from God's people into the "land of Shinar," to be set there "in her own place." So on the Day of Atonement the sins of Israel were taken away from their midst and banished from human society into the wilderness where no man dwells. The wilderness *is* inhabited—not by men, however, but by evil spirits. It was into the wilderness that Our Lord was led to be "tempted of the devil" (Matt. iv. 1); "the unclean spirit when he is gone out of the man passeth through *waterless places*" (Matt. xii. 43). It is to one of these evil spirits, *Azazel*, that this goat with its load of sin

[1] *Cf.* Dante's "Purgatorio" (Canto 33, ll. 91–99); when sin is forgiven and penance completed, its very remembrance is blotted out by the waters of Lethe.

[2] See an article by A. Smythe Palmer in the "Guardian," January 27, 1909, "The Spirit-land in Hebrew Folk-lore."

was sent. *Azazel* is mentioned in the Book of Enoch (viii. 1, x. 4–8) as a fallen angel, one of the "sons of God" mentioned in Gen. vi. 1, who for a punishment was bound hand and foot in the desert. Lev. xvi. does not say what *Azazel* will do with the goat, and there is no hint that it was doomed to a cruel fate: it was only to be "let go." Later Jewish ritual, as described in the Mishna tractate "Yoma" (= "The Day"), ordered that it should be cast down a precipice, but no Biblical support can be found for the idea that this goat was made to suffer, still less to be killed, in expiation for the sins of others. Nor do the translations of the Greek and Latin versions give any countenance to the idea of vicarious punishment. In all the various forms of the Greek versions, as also in the Vulgate *caper emissarius*, from which came our English "scape [= "escape"] goat" (first found in the Great Bible of 1539), the original idea is preserved. It was probably under the influence of Calvinism that this original idea was lost and a meaning attached to the scapegoat very different from its etymological significance.[1]

(E) *Completion of the sacrifices.*—In accordance with the invariable rule [2] the two Sin Offerings of this Day were followed by Burnt Offerings of two rams (verses 3, 5)—one for the Priests and one for the people (verse 24). For this purpose, and also to mark that the penitential side of the Day was over, Aaron is directed at this point to put off the linen garments

[1] It is significant that the scapegoat is never mentioned in the New Testament as a type of Our Lord. The reference in the words "that taketh away [or "beareth"—R.V., margin] the sin of the world" (John i. 29; *cf.* 1 John iii. 5; Heb. x. 4–11) is to the Sacrificial Lamb. Holman Hunt's picture certainly represents present-day popular ideas rather than the original Biblical teaching.

[2] See p. 53.

and to put on his proper Priestly vestments (verses 23, 24). The instruction to burn the fat of the Sin Offering (verse 25) is perhaps misplaced ; at any rate, we should expect this to take place and the Sin Offerings to be completed before the High Priest changed his vestments. Since the whole of the Priesthood (including the High Priest himself) was included among the offerers in both Sin Offerings, there was no sacrificing Priest as distinct from the offerers to whom the rest of the flesh could be assigned, and therefore, in accordance with the rule laid down in Leviticus vi. 30 (*cf.* x. 18) the whole carcass of both Sin Offerings (except the fat) was burnt (verse 27—*saraph*, not *hiqtir*[1]) *without the camp.*[2]

So the ceremonies of the great Day were concluded. Before we leave this description of them, attention may be drawn to a point which illustrates one of the great principles of the atoning Sacrifices. Although it was the sins of the whole people for a whole year for which atonement was to be made on this Day, yet the victim was only one goat. We should have expected hecatombs of victims if any idea of compensation entered into the question of atonement. The difference between the Sacrifices on the Day of Atonement and the ordinary Sin Offering for an individual layman was not in the number of victims or the cost they represented—it lay only in the bringing of the blood into the nearer Presence of God.

[1] See p. 80.

[2] *Cf.* Heb. xiii. 11, 12, a passage which shows once more how exclusively the author looks to the Day of Atonement as the type of the Christian Sacrifice.

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT UNDERLYING THE SACRIFICES

THE Hebrew *kipper*, translated "to make atonement," is the intensive form of a verb which in its primitive simple form, "*kaphar*," was obsolete probably before even the earliest part of the Hebrew Bible was written. Modern scholars are divided as to the original meaning of "*kaphar*." Some think it meant "to cover"; others—and these are probably in the majority—"to wipe."[1] The question is further complicated by the fact that the object of *kipper* is sometimes the *sin* (e.g. Ps. lxv. 3: "As for our transgressions, Thou shalt purge them away"; or in the passage Is. vi. 7: "Thy sin is purged"); sometimes *the face of the person sinned against*, as in Gen. xxxii. 20: "I will appease him [*lit.* "*kipper*" his face] with the present"; and sometimes, even the sinner himself (e.g. Deut. xxxii. 43; *cf.* Lev. xvi. 20, 33). Thus there are at least four possible suggestions as to the literal meaning underlying the use of *kipper* in connexion with the forgiveness of sin:

[1] E.g. Wellhausen, Deissman, and Brown-Driver-Briggs (Hebrew Lexicon, s.v.) favour "to cover"; Robertson Smith, Burney, Kennedy, "to wipe." The last (Hastings D. B. IV, 665) says "The most recent research seems to point in favour of the meaning 'to wipe off.'"

(1) To wipe away the sin. This is a very common idea in the Old Testament under various figures of speech, such as "to blot out," "wash away," "take away" sins (e.g. Ps. li. 9, lxxix. 9, cix. 14; Is. i. 18, xxvii. 9, xliv. 22; Neh. iv. 5; Jer. xviii. 23; Mic. vii. 19; John i. 29; Acts iii. 19, xxii. 16; Heb. ix. 26, x. 4; and akin to these are the many references to the cleansing of the sinner from his sin, e.g. Ps. li. 2; 1 John i. 7).

(2) To wipe the face of the offended person, i.e. to remove his anger, make his face shine with glad favour (*cf.* Num. vi. 25; Ps. xxxi. 16, lxvii. 1, lxxx. 3).

(3) To cover the sin so that it no more appears (see, e.g., Job xxxi, 33; Ps. xxxii. 1, lxxxv, 2; Jas. v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 8); this meaning often works out very nearly the same as (1).

(4) To cover the face of a person so that he no longer sees the offence (*cf.* Job ix. 24; 1 Sam. xii. 3; Ps. x. 11, li. 9).

The uncertainty is increased when we find that the subject of *kipper* is sometimes God Himself (e.g. Deut. xxi. 8, xxxii. 43; 2 Chron. xxx. 18; Ps. lxv. 3), in which case if any trace of the original meaning lingers the thing covered or wiped must be the sin, i.e. meanings (1) or (3). In the terminology of the Priestly Code, however, the agent who "makes atonement" is always the Priest, and the verb *kipper*, with one or two exceptions, is intransitive or at any rate the object is unexpressed. The Priest "makes atonement" "for" or "on behalf of" the sacrificer "because of" or "on account of" his sin. Lev. xvii. 11 ("it is the blood . . . that makes atonement") is

not inconsistent with this, since it is understood in all Sacrifices that the Priest makes atonement by means of the blood. When used transitively, *kipper* is followed by an accusative of the thing "covered" or "wiped," which is in this case not the sin, but the offender, e.g. the Holy Place, the Tent of Meeting, the altar, etc. (Lev. xvi. 20, 33; Ezek. xliii. 20, 26, xlv. 20), or the land and the people (Deut. xxxii. 43).

If we may set aside as exceptional the instances just mentioned where a place or a person is the object of "*kipper*," we can reduce the possible meanings to two groups of ideas. The first group describes the effect as regards God the Holy One, and includes the ideas connected with *propitiation*. The Greek Bible consistently translates *kipper* by ἐξιλάσκεσθαι (= to propitiate, to appease), and this seems to have been the thought most prominently associated with the Hebrew word at about the third century B.C. Closely akin to this is the idea of *reconciliation*. *Kipper* implies a reconciling of estranged parties, without necessarily stating on which side the estrangement has existed, i.e. whether it is man who is to be reconciled with God, or God with man. Reconciliation is therefore a wider idea than propitiation, which implies an offended God. The second group describes the effect upon the sin, and the ideas then suggested are the *forgiveness*, the *removal*, or the *annulment* of the sin. In the case of either group the English translation "to make atonement" is misleading at the present day. In the sixteenth century it was used in its literal sense to make an "at-one-ment," i.e. to reconcile, and this would fit the first group of ideas

(to propitiate). But nowadays "atonement" has come to imply the idea of reparation: we speak of an offender "atoning" for his faults. This is quite foreign to the Hebrew word. Further, the translation "to make atonement" overlooks entirely the second group of ideas (the forgiveness and annulment of the sin). It seems impossible, indeed, to find any one English equivalent which combines both senses, in which case it is perhaps best to leave the present E.V. translation "to make atonement" in possession, always remembering that both ideas (the reconciliation of the sinner and the undoing of the sin) must be included in the connotation of the phrase.

Up to this point we have been trying to get at the meaning of *kipper* in the general usage of the Old Testament. When we confine ourselves, as we may now do, to its particular use as a technical term in the Laws of Sacrifice, the matter becomes simpler in many ways.[1] In the first place, these Laws contain practically no idea of the Sacrifice being a means to appease the wrath of God. The Covenant relationship, although impaired, is not destroyed by the sins for which Sacrifices were provided. The sins, as we have seen, were almost entirely "unwitting" offences of a ceremonial nature. This being the case, such words as "propitiate" are misleading as applied to the sacrificial atonement, and we are left with the second meaning, to "purge" away the sin. Perhaps the best

[1] In one case incense is said to "make atonement" for the people (Numb. xvi. 46) when wrath had "gone out from the Lord." But it is not clear whether this was an *Offering* of incense any more than in Lev. xvi. 13, which is not an Offering, but, as it were, a veil between sinful man and God.

translation would be "to make a purging"—the unexpressed object being the sin, and in a few cases (see above) the thing or person polluted by the sin. This does not mean that the idea of reconciliation is entirely absent. The primary associations, however, are those of "covering" or "wiping away" the sin, "reconciliation" being a secondary and derivative idea.

How, then, was this "purging" effected by the Sacrifice? If we can find the answer to this question we shall get at the root of the doctrine of Atonement expressed in the Sacrifices of the Old Covenant. Let us consider, first, the once common theory of a *substitutionary* or *vicarious punishment*. The theory itself was straightforward and simple enough. The penalty of sin is death. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." In the sacrifice an animal victim was substituted for the sinner, and its death accepted by God as a satisfaction for the sin.[1] With these assumptions the acts of Sacrifice were interpreted as follows: By the laying on of hands the sacrificer transferred his sin to the victim, which was then put to death in his place. Its blood was poured on the altar as a proof before God that it had been slain; its body was burnt as a polluted thing, or (some said) as a type of the everlasting fire of Hell (*cf.* Is. lxvi. 24).

For the most part this conception of atonement was based on an *a priori* view of punishment and forgiveness. In human society the offender is punished for his misdeed and is then forgiven. The penalty is paid

[1] This theory has been so widely held that Kurtz in his "Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament" (written in 1862) speaks of it as "the orthodox traditional view," and traces it back to the Jewish Rabbis and the Early Christian Fathers (p. 123, English Translation).

and justice is satisfied. But if the penalty is death the offender is beyond the reach of forgiveness that follows. So the mercy of God provided as a substitute for the sinner an animal victim on which the guilt and the punishment were laid. Did not God provide just such a substitute in the ram which was offered instead of Isaac? Again, in the only place where a meaning is assigned to the laying on of hands in the Sacrifices, viz. the case of the scapegoat (Lev. xvi. 21), is it not clear that this ceremony symbolized the transferring of the offence from the sinner to the victim? "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel . . . and he shall put them upon the head of the goat." To the first of these instances we should reply that in the case of Isaac there was no question of sin or punishment. And to the second, that the "scapegoat" was not offered in a Sacrifice at all: the "atonement" for the sins of the people had already been made *before* the "scapegoat" came upon the scene.[1]

The evidence for this theory is doubtful; the objections to it are almost overwhelming. (*a*) No Sacrifice could make atonement for a sin that was punishable by death.[2] The very character of the "sins" for which the Sin Offering was provided seems decisive against the *poena vicaria*. (*b*) There is nothing in the regulations of the Sacrifices which gives any support to the idea of propitiating an angry God.

[1] Robertson Smith, "Semites," pp. 422–443. For a consideration of Is. liii. 10, sometimes urged in favour of the *poena vicaria*, see p. 102.

[2] See pp. 57 f.

(*c*) It may be taken as a sure guide in explaining the Sacrifices that it is to the peculiar ceremonial of each Offering we must look for an explanation of its special object and purpose. Now, in the Sin Offering, where the making of atonement is the chief object in view, the peculiar feature of the ceremonial appears not in the slaughtering of the victim, but in what was afterwards done with the blood. The slaughtering was the same in the Sin Offering as in the other Sacrifices. It is not in the death of the victim, but in the "putting" of the blood on the Horns of the Altar that we shall find the explanation of the means of atonement. This is borne out by Lev. xvii. 11: "I have given it [i.e. the blood] to you *upon the altar* [i.e. as presented after the victim's death] to make atonement for your souls." The theory of a *poena vicaria* throws the whole emphasis on the act of slaughtering, since it makes the death the central feature of the Sacrifice. But as this part of the ceremonial was precisely the same in all the Sacrifices, we should expect them all to be alike in their atoning purpose and power: which, of course, was not the case. Again, if the killing of the victim occupied such a central position in the ceremonial of Sacrifice, we should expect to find the ceremonial rubrics of the Law laying particular stress upon this act. But, on the contrary, there is less detail prescribed in regard to this than to any of the other acts. It simply says the sacrificer shall kill it "before the Lord," "on the side of the altar northward," or "at the door of the Tent of Meeting" (Lev. i. 5, 11, iii. 2). The brevity of the instructions seems designed to pass by the killing as

a feature necessary indeed, but only as a preliminary to the later and culminating acts, viz. the disposal of the carcass in the Burnt and Peace Offerings, and the presentation of the blood in the Sin Offering. Later Jewish thought also recognized the truth that "the sprinkling of the blood is the main point in sacrifice."[1] (*d*) Other features of the ceremonial also tell against this theory. If the laying on of hands signified the transferring of the sin, the body of the sin-bearing victim would be regarded as polluted and accursed. But, on the contrary, even in the Sin Offering it is a "most holy thing." Its touch "consecrates" anyone who comes in contact with it, so that he must wash before he goes back to secular life (Lev. vi. 27, 28). As being "most holy" it could be eaten by the Priests alone. The burning of the fat, so far from being destructive or penal, was the means of sending it up "in sweet smoke" to Jehovah, for whom it makes a "sweet savour of acceptance" (Lev. iv. 31). The use of the technical word *hiqtir* as distinct from *saraph* is itself enough to dispose of the idea that the burning denoted a penal destruction. Lastly, if the killing represented Divine punishment for sin, the true expression of this idea in the ceremonial would be for the Priest, as the representative of God, to kill the victim. But there is no evidence that the Priest *qua* Priest ever slew the animal: where he did so, it was either as sacrificer or as representing and included among the sacrificers, e.g. on the Day of Atonement.

[1] Maimonides (a Spanish Jew born at Cordova in A.D. 1135), "De Sacrificantibus," i, 2. § 6; quoted in Westcott, "Hebrews," p. 269.

The victim was always killed either by the sacrificer himself, or by someone representing him.[1]

These facts are decisive as against any view of the transference of guilt and punishment from the sinner to the victim. But what are we to put in its place?

Let us first review the facts to be taken into consideration in answering this question.

We shall naturally take as our starting point the only passage in the Law which suggests an interpretation of the ceremonial and points to the means by which the atonement was made: "The life [= "soul," R.V., margin] of the flesh is in the blood: and *I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life*" (Lev. xvii. 11). It should be noted that this interpretation is not given on purpose to explain the ceremonial. The Law gives no explanation of the meaning of its regulations. They were symbolic and had a meaning of their own, the knowledge of which is taken for granted. The immediate purpose of these words is to give a reason why blood was a forbidden food. The "soul" of the flesh is in the blood; for that reason the blood upon the altar makes atonement for your souls (the same word—*nephesh*—is used in both places in the Hebrew); and therefore blood may not be used as a food. This is a great departure from those heathen Semitic Sacrifices in which the drinking of the blood was an essential feature. In this passage the blood, as the *living life that has passed through death* (for that is what is meant by the "blood"[2]) is said to make atonement.

[1] See p. 64. [2] See p. 68.

Now, let us take up another point in this verse. What is involved in the words: "upon the altar"? We saw (p. 71) that there were two distinct purposes for which the blood was applied to the altar: to consecrate or reconsecrate the altar itself and to present the blood to God. We speak of these as distinct purposes, but possibly there was once some unifying idea, now lost to us, which linked them together. In the great Sin Offerings of the Day of Atonement both purposes were included in the "sprinkling" of the blood: the High Priest "offered" the blood (Heb. ix. 7; *cf.* 25.; and ? Lev. xvi. 6, 11), and the blood "cleansed" the Tabernacle (Heb. ix. 23; *cf.* Lev. xvi. 16, 17, 19). If, however, the latter purpose was ever attached to the ordinary Sin Offering, all trace of it has completely disappeared in the regulations for its ceremonial and in the descriptions of it in the history of worship. The blood was certainly "presented on the altar in the Burnt" Offering (Lev. i. 5; *cf.* Ps. l. 13) and the Peace Offering (Lev. vii. 33), and Heb. ix. 7 shows that, in the Sin Offering also, the "sprinkling" or "putting" of the blood, signified the offering of it to God. This point is of such importance that it is well to draw attention to it, although it has been generally taken for granted. It would be possible, however, to make out a case for the contention that on the Day of Atonement (and by inference in the ordinary Sin Offerings) the "cleansing" of the holy places and of the worshippers was the only object in view in the ceremonial use of the blood, and that no Godward intention of Offering attached to it. This contention, if made good, would have a most important

bearing on the doctrine of Atonement. It would affect the New Testament as well, for the sprinkling of the blood on the Day of Atonement is made the type of the self-oblation of Jesus Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary (Heb. ix.). There is a cleansing of the "heavenly things themselves" by the Blood of Christ as well as of their earthly copies on the Day of Atonement. But, also, as the High Priest offered the blood of others year by year in the Holy Place, so Christ offers Himself in the Heavenly Sanctuary (Heb. ix. 25). In both Covenants there is an "Offering" of the blood to make atonement.

We have now reached a second stage in our investigation. In the atoning Sacrifices the blood—the life that has been laid down in death but still lives—is offered to God upon the altar, and as so offered cleanses the altar and the worshipper. A third fact emerges from the answer to the question: Whose life is represented by the blood? The blood of bulls and goats? Yes; but was that all? What was implied in the relation of the sacrificer to his victim? What was symbolized by the laying on of hands? We have seen (pp. 18–21, 63) that the connexion between offerer and victim was so close that it could in no unreal sense be called an identity, and that the laying on of hands symbolically represented the identification. In symbol the worshipper laid down his own life; in symbol it was the worshipper's own "blood" which the Priest "put" on the Horns of the Altar or "sprinkled" on the Mercy Seat. The goat or bullock was not a victim entirely "other" to the man who offered it; the Offering was not merely "vicarious" in the sense

of being made instead of, in the place of (*vice*), another. The victim was not a substitute but a representative, a deputy, for that other, and in symbol identified with him: "He shall lay his hand upon the head of the victim, and it shall be accepted *for* [לְ the *dativus commodi*] him, and *make atonement for* [עַל "on behalf of"] him" (Lev. i. 4). It was *the sacrificer's own life* which first was laid down in death, and then "upon the altar" made atonement for him; *his own "soul" in a further and higher stage of spiritual development makes atonement for itself—himself—in his present sin-laden, sin-polluted state.* The perfected "risen" self redeems the sinful self; his own repentance carried to its completion through a death unto self, self-will, sin, earns his forgiveness.

The Christian will say, Who is sufficient unto these things? Do not we also need someone other and better than ourselves yet wholly one with us, to be the victim we offer? Such for each one and all mankind is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. And that other yet one and the same with ourselves who is perfectly represented in the Son of Man, was partially and typically represented by the animal victim in the old Sacrifices.

The blood signifies, therefore, the sacrificer's own life seen in its ideal perfection in that other yet the same life which has gone through death. The sacrificer must perforce be represented by another for (1) the atonement could only be effected through a dying, a life wholly surrendered with nothing kept back, and (2) the life was to be "presented" to God; but who would dare present his own life in its *actual*

sin-defiled state to the Holy God? Sin is repeatedly compared by the Prophets to adultery: it is unfaithfulness to One to Whom man owes himself altogether soul and body. If the wife commits adultery with another, it is not enough for her simply to return to her true allegiance. She dare not bring back and offer to her husband a polluted self. So the sinner, after his sin, dare not offer to God a polluted life; yet it is only by offering himself again to God that he can cleanse and reconsecrate his life. This was the dilemma to meet which the Sacrifices were provided by God under the Old Covenant as the type to be fulfilled in the New. All speaks of Divine Love and Mercy. The desire of God is that the sinner may be restored to the Covenant Sonship from which he has fallen. The system of atoning Sacrifices was a provision of God for bringing back the Prodigal to the Father's Home. "*I have given you* the blood . . . to make atonement for your souls." God will provide Himself a Lamb.

There remains yet one more stage in our reconstruction of the ideas of atonement underlying the atoning Sacrifices, viz. to bring together our third fact (that the blood is the sacrificer's own life), and the second (the nature and meaning of the altar transaction). What was done with the blood and what did it mean? We saw that the "putting" of the blood upon the Horns of the Altar in an ordinary Sin Offering signified the "presenting" of it to God, and that the "sprinkling" on the Mercy Seat and the "putting" on the Horns of the Altar of Incense and the Altar of Burnt Offering on the Day of Atonement

signified, in addition to this, the cleansing touch of the blood upon the Holy Places and upon the people whose Offering it was; further, that perhaps (though unexpressed) the same cleansing of altar and people was meant to be effected by the ordinary Sin Offerings. Can we get beyond this? We hinted above at a possible link—known perhaps to the Jews of old, but since forgotten—which might connect the two apparently distinct and separate ideas. I will venture tentatively to suggest such a link. We have repeatedly been reminded of the fact that to the Jewish Law "cleansing" and "consecrating" were not two but one thing, the obverse and reverse of one single act by which a thing or person is withdrawn from the general secular world of things "common or unclean" into the circle of "holy" things, hallowed and consecrated to God. Every "cleansing" is *ipso facto* a "hallowing" or consecrating; and, vice versa, every "consecrating" is *ipso facto* a "cleansing." Now, what is meant by "consecrating" a thing to God? Is it not just handing it over to Him—"dedicating" in the etymological sense of "making over" to God: in other words, "presenting," "offering" to Him? The very act of presenting a thing to God consecrates it and therefore "cleanses" it. Presenting, consecrating, cleansing are, after all, just one and the same thing viewed from different angles, and to "make atonement" covers all three intentions. So it is the blood upon the altar that makes atonement because, being presented to God and dedicated to Him, it is thereby hallowed, cleansed from all impurities contracted in the world and consecrated to be a possession

of God. Remembering that this "blood" was (in symbol) the sacrificer's own life: that he belonged to a people called out from among the common "Gentile" herd to be a nation "holy unto the Lord," a peculiar treasure unto Him from among all peoples (Exod. xix. 5), which had been once and for all cleansed and consecrated by the "blood of the Covenant" (Exod. xxiv. 8; *cf.* Heb. ix. 18–22): and that the effect of sin is to pollute and desecrate the sinner: we see that to "make atonement" means in effect to restore to his proper "nearness" to Jehovah one who has lost it by an offence. He was "far off," but he is now brought "near" again. It is of interest to notice that the very word translated "to present" (*hiqrib*) means literally "to bring near." The difference of ceremonial between the different Sin Offerings acquires a fresh interest in this light. "Holiness" admitted of degrees: there were degrees of spiritual "nearness" to Jehovah which were symbolized by degrees of physical nearness. The individual lay Israelite was admitted into the Fore-Court of the Tabernacle, from which the heathen was excluded. In the Sin Offering the Horns of the Great Altar of Burnt Offering "before the Lord" at the door of the Tabernacle represented the limit of his approach to God; and it was to that degree of "Holiness" he was restored by the blood of the Sin Offering "put" on the Horns of this Altar. The "anointed Priest" and the Priestly nation as a community (which included, of course, the Priesthood as well as the laity) were admitted within the "first Tabernacle" (i.e. the Holy Place), and for them the blood was "put" on the Horns of the Altar of Burnt

Incense, which stood "before the veil" and was the link between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies.[1] Lastly, on the Day of Atonement, which was a sort of annual renewal of the first dedication of the people (the inaugural Covenant Sacrifice of Exod. xxiv. 1–8), Priesthood and people were restored to the closest approach to God permitted to earthly men—the Holy of Holies and the Presence above the Mercy Seat.

It will be seen that in this light the sacrificial atonement is brought back to something like its original and etymological sense ("at-one-ment"), and also into close relation with the idea of "reconciliation" (*cf.* Eph. ii. 13, 18; 1 Pet. iii. 18). An estrangement has intervened between God and man and they are brought together again. But it is man who has estranged himself from God. The estrangement is not on God's side. It is God Who seeks for reconciliation and provides the means for an at-one-ment. There is no propitiating or pacifying of God in the Sin Offering. There is no thought of a "satisfaction" or "recompense" made by man; far less of a quantitative satisfaction proportioned to the number or enormity of the offences.

At the risk of some repetition it will repay us to go over the ceremonial of the Sin Offering again in the light of these ideas. Of the laying on of hands enough

[1] So closely in fact was it connected with the Holy of Holies that some passages (e.g. Ex. xxx. 6, xl. 5; 1 Kings vi. 22) gave the impression that it was actually inside the veil. This accounts for the descriptions in Rev. viii. 3, ix. 13, xi. 1, and the apparent mistake of Heb. ix. 3. I say "apparent" because in any case the verse reveals an extremely intimate knowledge of the Jewish worship.

has been said. We have touched also upon the slaughtering as expressing self-renunciation in its extremest form. He who would be dedicated to God must *first* die to self. The self-regarding life can never be the dedicated life. Self-love is innate and inbred in fallen human nature. Sin is the following of self-love; and the only salvation, the only redemption, from sin—the only undoing of sin—lies in its complete opposite, an absolute self-surrender, a self-sacrifice, so entire that no self-regarding element is left in it, i.e. in a death unto self. So the sacrificer in symbol dies to himself. *This death is essential for the undoing of sin.* It has been the fashion sometimes, in reaction from the theory of Sacrifice described at the opening of this chapter, to run to the opposite extreme of treating the killing of the victim as a mere incident of no great intrinsic importance. This is a great mistake. "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." The offering of the blood still within the body of the victim would represent a life unsurrendered; to offer some only of the blood drawn from its body would typify the surrender of but a part of the life. The *entire* surrender of the *whole* life is essential before it can be given over to God, and therefore nothing less than the death of the victim is required, though but a little of its blood was needed to "put" on the Horns of the Altar. But as soon as it has been laid down in death the life acquires a new power and a new value. It is in the Pauline spiritual sense a "risen life." The blood "speaketh" of penitence and surrender to God (Heb. xii. 24).

But, when the death is accomplished, the atonement

is not yet made. It is not effected by the death of the sinner, necessary though that death may be, as a prior condition. It is *through* a death unto sin and *by* a life unto God that atonement is made ; and it is to the latter—the dedication of the surrendered life—that we now turn. We notice that in the symbolic acts of the Sacrifice this was the work not of the sacrificer but of the Priest. The sacrificer has done all that is even ideally possible for him to do : he has loved not his life unto death. But the atonement is not yet wrought—the sinner cannot restore *himself* to " holiness." For this he needs a mediator, and therefore at this point the Priest comes in to make the penitence effectual by offering to God the surrendered life and so to consecrate and cleanse it.[1]

Before concluding this chapter we may briefly compare the idea of atonement above described with the *poena vicaria*. Perhaps the chief point of difference will be found in the shifting of the centre of gravity from the death of the victim (in the *poena vicaria* theory) to the presenting of the blood. But while it is true to say that we regard the presenting of the blood (the reconsecration of the cleansed life) as the culmination of the Sin Offering, and the victim's death as a preliminary condition, we must again emphasize the fact that the latter is an *indispensable* condition. The two theories have been described as follows : while the *poena vicaria* theory may be compared to a circle having for its centre the death, our view likens the Sin Offering to an ellipse having for its

[1] With the whole of this paragraph *cf.* W. Milligan, " Resurrection of Our Lord," pp. 274–280.

two foci the death and the presenting of the blood. The latter comparison perhaps over-emphasizes the slaughtering, but it has the merit of recognizing it as an essential element in the Sacrifices. It safeguards the double side of atonement in the same way as St. Paul does in regard to the Christian fulfilment of the Sin Offering, when he says of Christ, the Sacrificer, Priest, and Victim, that we are reconciled by His " death " and " saved by His [risen] Life " (Romans v. 8) ; with which we may compare *ib.* vi. 1–11, where Christians are described as so identified with Christ by Baptism that, united with His Sacrificial Death and Risen Life (= Blood), they also are " dead indeed unto sin " but " alive unto God " (i.e. reconsecrated). The fact that St. Paul is not speaking in sacrificial terms, or indeed with the Jewish Sacrifices before his mind, makes all the more impressive the close agreement between his line of thought and this interpretation of the Sin Offering and of atonement in general.

There is another point in reference to which we may compare the two theories of atonement, viz. the *vicariousness* of the Sacrifices. No interpretation of the Jewish Sacrifices can get rid of this element. The fact is indisputable that the animal suffered death and *its* blood was presented ; this, and not anything done or suffered by the sacrificer, constituted the Sacrifice on its " outward and visible " side. But there is a great difference between the idea of *mere substitution* —the one of two quite unrelated lives being arbitrarily substituted for the other—and the idea of *representation*, in which a close union existing between the two

gives the one a kind of right to represent the other, as e.g., one brother might stand for another. And such a union we have seen to exist between sacrificer and victim. It was his property, it represented his labour, it had been bred and brought up by him, it would have supplied his life-sustaining food, and as such it received from him, by the laying on of hands, the right to stand for him. Subject to this reservation the Sacrifice *was* vicarious. But, as we have seen, it was vicarious as the *vicarious offering of a risen life*, rather than the *vicarious suffering of a penal death*. What does this amount to when we come to think it out further? It must be a risen life that is offered and there must be a death before there can be a risen life: the risen life is only risen because it has first died. That "*must*" is the Divine decree because of sin. Does not this give back to the death of the victim something of the penal character we have taken from it? Undeniably it does: *suffering unto death is a penal condition for the sinner's reunion with the Holy God*; and, where this suffering is undergone by one on behalf of another, that is a vicarious enduring of punishment. What we have gained over the theory of the *poena vicaria* is that we have found the suffering to be a means, *a preliminary condition*, to that which constituted the atonement (viz. the rededication of new life to God) rather than the end. The death is not regarded in itself as a satisfaction, a propitiation, an atonement. From the moral standpoint this makes an immeasurable difference between the two theories of atonement.

It is in the light of such thoughts as these that we must regard the idea of vicarious suffering

and its redemptive value, especially as it appears in Is. liii.: "He was wounded for our transgressions . . . The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." His soul (= life = blood) was made a "*Trespass Offering*" (see R.V. margin); not a "*Sin Offering*" (as in the text of R.V.) for the simple reason that the Sin Offering did not exist at the time this chapter was written. It is also possible that the word *aṣam* in this passage is not used in its sacrificial sense at all, but with its earlier non-sacrificial meaning of a payment made in compensation for an offence.[1] But although "he was cut off out of the land of the living," there is a risen life and a glorious future for Him beyond His suffering and death. "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied."

. . . . .

Before we pass from the Jewish to the Christian Sacrifice we may briefly trace the development of the pre-Christian idea of atonement in the Hebrew and Jewish Sacrifices. Four stages are seen to emerge:

(1) The earliest form in which the idea seems to exist and express itself is in Semitic heathenism. In very early times, yet late enough, however, for the childlike gladness of primitive Semitic worship to have been troubled by sorrow and suffering, the feeling crept into men's minds that something had caused an estrangement between their god and themselves.

See p. 45.

The sharing of the victim's blood, which was the common life-bond between them, was then held to have obliterated *ipso facto* any strained relations. Feeding together proved the friendship to have been re-established and the union restored. In this light communion presupposed and implied atonement (in the sense of reconciliation) rather than effected it. Whatever quarrel may have existed, both parties desired its removal; they were already friends at heart before the common meal cemented the reunion.

(2) With the entry of the *Gift idea* into Hebrew Sacrifice, and the deepening sense of Divine disfavour, undoubtedly at first there arose the picture of an angry God to be propitiated by a gift just as a subject might try to appease an offended monarch by a present. So David says: "If it be the Lord that hath stirred thee up against me, let Him accept an offering"—*lit.* "*smell a minḥah*" (1 Sam. xxvi. 19) *cf.* Gen. viii. 21 "The Lord smelt the sweet savour" (of Noah's Burnt Offerings) "and said, I will not curse the ground any more for man's sake." The gift might be the fruit of the field (*minḥah*: see 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, quoted above; also *ibid.* iii. 14) or the flesh of a Burnt Offering (Gen. viii. 21).

(3) But gradually the supreme sanctity of the life-containing and life-conveying blood brought about the recognition that the highest gift of all was the "blood"; and as nothing less than the highest would suffice, so it was especially in the presenting of the blood that atonement was effected after the estrangement caused by sin. The appearance of the "Gift idea" created entirely different associations in connexion with the

blood of the Sacrifices. The original purpose of the blood as the bond of union between the God and His worshippers remained as a survival in the Sacrifices for inaugurating a "Covenant" (Exod. xxiv.) and for the "cleansing" of the Tabernacle by blood on the Day of Atonement. It appeared also in the power of the blood to "make holy" the thing or person it touched, e.g. in the restoration of a leper and the consecration of a Priest. But the later idea of the "life-blood" as the most precious gift to be presented to the Lord quite overshadowed the older, just as the "Gift idea" came to be the most prominent intention of Jewish Sacrifice in general.

(4) Lastly, so far as the victim was in some sort identified with the sacrificer emerges the thought that this life presented in propitiation for a sin is the sinner's own life, which by the very act of presentation is "brought near" to God, reconciled, reunited, and restored to the Priest's or the layman's degree of nearness to God. The sinner's life, as represented by the victim's blood, is touched by the sanctifying altar or Mercy Seat, and so is reunited to God—reconsecrated. And, conversely, on the Day of Atonement, the "Blood" as being a risen life dead to sin but alive unto God, reconsecrates the sacred spot which has been desecrated by contact with sin. So, while the offering of the best a man has to give (his own life) satisfies Divine justice and holiness—the only sense in which a "propitiation" can be understood in the highest development of the Jewish Sacrifices—the mode of presentation (i.e. the ceremonial use of the blood) reconsecrates the life, reconciles, reunites it to God.

PART II

THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW COVENANT

CHAPTER VI

COMPARISON OF THE OLD AND THE NEW

MOST of us, I suppose, if told to compare the Jewish Sacrifices with the Christian Sacrifice would at once think of the points of contrast familiar to us from the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the same Epistle, it is to be noted, in the very act of contrasting the two, implies and draws out points of likeness. Modern controversies have drawn attention, disproportionately perhaps, to the contrasts, and left the spiritual side of the old Sacrifices too much in the background. A study of the opening part of the Sermon on the Mount should correct this one-sided valuation. The New Covenant is not a reversal but a fulfilment of the Old. There is a true line of continuity between them. The same truth is embodied in both : perfectly and fully in the New, but present, or at least foreshadowed, in the Old. It is to this side of the comparison we will first address ourselves.

We have already had occasion in the previous chapters to anticipate some of these points of likeness.

At the outset, in Chapter I,[1] the primitive notion of communion with God through the drinking of blood was seen to be present, though dormant, all through the historical period of the Jewish religion to revive in a "heavenly and spiritual manner" in Christianity. Then we saw how the Gift idea developed until some at least of the higher spirits among the Jewish saints realized that the only perfect gift is the gift of ourselves, and that in true Sacrifice the offerer must offer *himself*, i.e. sacrificer and victim, the giver and the thing given, must be personally identical.[2] Again this self-oblation was expressed under two forms in the Old Covenant, and in either case the latent spiritual meaning becomes explicit in the New. In the Burnt Offering it was characteristically expressed by the burning of the carcass, which went up in "sweet smoke" to Jehovah. In the New Testament the thought and the phraseology are taken over in the description of the God-dedicated life and its virtues as an "odour of a sweet smell" (Phil. iv. 18; *cf.* Eph. v. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 15). In all the Sacrifices, but particularly in the Sin Offering, the self-oblation was expressed in the offering of blood as a life first surrendered in death, then received back by a Resurrection and rededicated as a Risen Life. And this, too, is expressed in the Christian religion by the symbolism of immersion in Baptism, signifying the death unto sin and the new birth unto Righteousness, and in the continued stress on the need of self-mortification before a man can dedicate his life to God. In several of the details also we have seen in the Old an anticipation

[1] See pp. 13, 14. [2] See, e.g. pp. 16–22.

of the New; e.g. the order of the Sacrifices (Sin, Burnt, Peace Offering),[1] the relative importance of the death and the oblation as set forth in the ceremonial acts (p. 67), the meaning of the "Table of the Lord" (p. 78). The very use of the word "blood" in the New Testament at once links up the New Covenant with the Sacrificial System of the Old. We do well then to remind ourselves first of the essential unity or continuity between the Jewish and the Christian Sacrifice. Here also Jesus Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law—to take up and carry on to their complete perfection the spiritual ideas contained, though partially, and expressed, though imperfectly, under the older forms. We shall see that Hebrews ix. is quite as much imbued with the identity as with the contrast between the Day of Atonement and the Death and Priesthood of Jesus. Sacrifice is inherent in the New Covenant as in the Old, and in both the same lines of truth are discerned by eyes open to the vision revealed by Him.

There are one or two points with regard to this continuity which call for further notice. The most familiar of all contrasts between the Old and the New is the many Sacrifices of the former and the one Sacrifice of the latter. The comparison is applied generally to the endless repetition of the Old Sacrifices, as against the "one oblation of Himself once offered." But it applies also to the many different kinds of Offering in the Old, the meal Offering, Burnt, Peace, Sin, and Trespass Offerings. The one Sacrifice of Christ gathers up and embraces all the different

[1] See pp. 52 f.

meanings and purposes of the former many. But this is an advance in the line of continuity rather than a reversal of the old. And to a certain extent it was foreshadowed by the frequent combination of Sin, Burnt, and Peace Offerings on the same occasion; as if to acknowledge that the meaning of Sacrifice was only partly expressed in any one of the three by itself, and for the whole meaning we must look to one complex offering combining all of them.[1] Every aspect and every intention of Sacrifice is included in the One Sacrifice of the New Covenant: the self-oblation for the purpose of making atonement (corresponding to the offering of the blood in the Old Sacrifices, Lev. xvii. 11); the self-oblation with the simple intention of self-dedication[2] (answering to the burning of the carcass); the common meal shared by the sacrificer, his friends, the Priest, and God Himself. So the characteristic intentions of the Sin and Burnt and Peace Offerings are here combined in one single Sacrifice. There is another point of likeness and continuity which I must ask the reader to take for granted until it comes up for fuller discussion:[3] the acts which make up the complete drama of Sacrifice follow the same order in the Old and New Covenants. We shall see how the ceremonial acts described in Chapter III are repeated in the same order, no longer as ceremonial symbols, but as actual realities, in the Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus Christ and through the Eucharist in His Body, the Church.

[1] See p. 54.

[2] Heb. x. 5 describes the offering of "a perfect life irrespective of any thought of sin" (Westcott's "Commentary," *ad loc.*, p. 310).

[3] See Chapter VIII.

Let us turn now to the *differences* between the two Sacrifices, i.e. the points in regard to which the first was so inadequate that it had to be "taken away" in order for the second to be "established." At once we think of the complete change in all the outward and visible side, the "ceremonial" expression. The Christian Church has entirely discarded animal Sacrifice. And while there is some outward as well as inner spiritual likeness between the victim's death in the Jewish Temple and on Calvary, there was this paramount contrast. In the Death on Calvary there was something which made its repetition unnecessary and therefore impossible. Equally also there was something in the Jewish Sacrifices which made it not only possible but essential that the Offering must be repeated again and again. The underlying difference is, of course, that Calvary was the Perfect Sacrifice —perfect in itself as a Sacrifice, but perfect also as securing finally and for ever the objects for which it was made on our behalf. The old Sacrifices, on the other hand, were imperfect in themselves, and therefore necessarily unable to "make perfect them that draw nigh" (Heb. x. 1).

The perfect Sacrifice must be perfect in all the elements which go to make it up. Its agents, the Sacrificer, the Victim, and the Priest, must be fitted each to carry out his part: inwardly in heart with the right intention in the right degree, and also in outward qualification duly authorized to fulfil his office. The Sacrificer must be within the Covenant, the Victim worthy of its offerer, the Priest properly called and appointed. Lastly, the external setting of the Sacri-

fice, the "ceremonial acts," must be such as are worthy and adequate to express in its fullness the inner intention. This is an important consideration. The moralizing of Sacrifice does not lie in "dropping the outward expression and accentuating solely the inward act of will . . . it is essential to Sacrifice that it should be the outward act by which the inward intention is realized."[1] Consider now how the Old Sacrifices fell short of these requirements.

(1) "Self-surrender, self-dedication": these we saw to be the inward intentions of true Sacrifice. But the Jewish sacrificer at his best was but dimly conscious that this was what God asked of him; and even so far as he understood it, the best he could give was a very far from a perfect surrender.

(2) The Priest must be a true Priest. The Aaronic Priest was himself a sinful man and needed such a Priest to be his own mediator (Heb. v. 3). His Priesthood was divinely authorized indeed (Heb. v. 4) but only until such time as it should be merged in a Priest of a higher order (Heb. vii. 11–18).

(3) The victim must be not merely perfect of its kind but also of a kind spiritually equivalent to the sacrificer. But an animal life, however perfect of its kind, could never be sufficient to represent a human life: it is of a lower order. Again, the victim must actually and entirely represent the offerer's own self —not partly represent it, nor even fully represent just a part of himself and not the whole. Does it not follow from these requirements that the Perfect Sacrifice cannot be a vicarious Offering? But with the Jews

[1] Scott Holland in "Sanday Priesthood and Sacrifice," p. 85.

the life laid down was not only something else's life instead of the sacrificer's. It was not even voluntarily surrendered, but forcibly and brutally taken. How could such an action be an adequate outward expression of the voluntary surrender of one's own life? At the best it was but an acted parable of Sacrifice, not the real thing itself. It was inevitable, therefore, that when the true meaning of Sacrifice was revealed, not merely in vision or in word, but in the object-lesson of realized fact, the offering of animal victims should cease to have any longer a place in the worship of God. The Sacrifices of the Old Covenant continually reminded the worshippers of sins: in them was an "ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν" (Heb. x. 3), because they never really made atonement for them. But when we share in the Sacrifice of the Covenant we are reminded ("this do εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν"—1 Cor. xi. 24, 25) of the Lamb of God which *taketh away* the sin of the world. So, in common with the Covenant to which they belonged, the old Sacrifices suggested needs and aroused desires which they could not fulfil or satisfy, and by that very fact they pointed forward to the better Sacrifice of the "Lamb of God."

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE: CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

WHEN we speak of the Sacrifice of the New Covenant our thoughts turn to One Person, Jesus Christ, and to one place and moment, Golgotha and the Crucifixion. But, right though it is, this does not in itself contain the whole of the truth. Questions at once arise and demand an answer. Is there no place for the Resurrection and the Ascension in the Christian Sacrifice? In what sense, if any, may we speak of a Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist? Again, in what sense and by what means does the Sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ become to each one of us "*my* Sacrifice" and to all of us corporately "the Church's Sacrifice"? Have we not seen that no true Sacrifice can be vicarious? The offering of Himself by Jesus Christ may truly be for *Him* a Perfect Sacrifice, but how can it be such for *me*? The answer to the last three questions takes us right into the heart of deep mysteries—the Incarnation and the Atonement. What is meant by the union betwixt Christ and the Church which is His Body? In what sense have we each a personal distinctness apart from the common humanity, which is all "summed up" in Him? We have only to put

together the two truths—(1) that He offered a Sacrifice for sins, (2) that He was sinless and did not need to offer such a Sacrifice for Himself—to see that He and His Sacrifice are representative of mankind. He is not isolated from us, and merely setting before us an object-lesson of Perfect Sacrifice. We are in Him, and that Sacrifice is ours in being His. But does this mean that, after all, we share in it vicariously, by some sort of more or less unreal "imputation"? Is there nothing corresponding to it that has to be fulfilled in *our* lives before that Sacrifice can be said to be in the true sense completely ours? Without following out in detail this line of thought, may I summarize what seems to be the issue of it? Such a summary statement is necessary here as a postulate to certain sides of our view of the Christian Sacrifice.

In the Manhood of Jesus Christ is summed up the whole human race. He is not just one among many, a son of man, but One in Whom all others are represented, *the* Son of Man. When, therefore, He offers His Sacrifice to the Father, He does so not in our stead, but on our behalf.[1] We may perhaps compare Him with the minister in public worship who offers the prayer of spoken words not *instead of* but on *behalf of* the congregation. If he were acting instead of the people, all that would matter would be his personal sincerity and faith. But because he speaks on their behalf their co-operation is demanded: each and all must pray with him, must be filled with the spirit of the prayer he utters. So if Jesus Christ offers the

[1] The reader will remember that the regular preposition in the New Testament in this connexion is not ἀντί (instead of) but ὑπέρ (on behalf of).

Sacrifice on our behalf we too must do what He does. . . . But we cannot. The vision of the ideal is beyond our ken, the intention beyond our reach ; still less possible is its fulfilment in act and suffering. And yet when God sees within us, at the very bottom of our personality, a tiny seed-germ of Faith, accepting this Sacrifice as our own, and therefore desiring to make it *actually* our own, He is ready here and now to account it ours and to respond to it with His gifts of Forgiveness, Reconsecration, and Reunion—the fruits of the Sin, the Burnt, and the Peace Offering. So shall we be ever strengthened until, our manhood made perfect even as His, we can ourselves offer the Perfect Sacrifice.

But there is something more than a difference of time between the fulfilment of Sacrifice in Christ and in us. We are sinners, He is sinless ; and the *sinner can never make atonement for his own sin.* Even could he live the life of perfect dedication, what would that be but simply what he would have owed to his Maker if he had never sinned ? It is the Sinless One, living the life of perfect dedication *at the utmost cost*, of suffering even unto death, who pays the price of sin. The Sacrifice of Christ alone can be called in the true sense the Sin Offering. Even were our Sacrifice like His in outward form it could not bear this fruit : it would not be a " propitiation for sin." Ours is the Burnt Offering of dedicated life which follows upon and is made possible and acceptable only through the preceding Sin Offering. The spiritual order is the same as in the Old Covenant,[1] and again, as of old,

[1] See p. 52.

the response to Sin and Burnt Offering comes in the Peace Offering with the call to fellowship with God, with the Priest and with one another in Christ Jesus. He it is Who offers the Peace-Offering and bids God and man to join with Him in the Feast.

So we reach a wider view of the Christian Sacrifice: it is the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ taken up and carried on by His Body, the Church, as her Burnt Offering of dedicated life and her Peace Offering of the Eucharistic Feast. All three types of Offering are fulfilled in Him: the Sin Offering by His Death and Priestly entrance to the Heavenly Holy of Holies to offer the Blood upon the Mercy Seat (Heb. ix. 11, 12, 23–26); the Burnt Offering by the "Offering of His Body" Heb. x. 5–10 (see Westcott's note *ad loc.*) in lifelong dedication, "to do the Will of Him that sent Me"; the Peace Offering (in its characteristic feature the Fellowship with God) through the Ascension and taking of His Manhood to sit at the right hand of the Father on the Throne of His Glory. As the glorified Son returns to the Fellowship with the Father, which He had before the world was, He brings with Him His Manhood, uniting it into the same Fellowship with God.

In *all* this the Church, which is His Body, has a share in virtue of Her Union with Her Lord. This Union, effected in the Incarnation, whereby the Son of God took Humanity into Unity with His Divinity, and renewed in every Eucharist, whereby we take unto ourselves again His Sacred Humanity, for ever unites His Sacrifice to ours. Whatever He does, the Church, His Body, the organ of His sacrificial work

and suffering, does in and through Him. Whatever His Church does, He does in and through Her. We cannot separate, except in thought, the Sacrifice of Christ and that of His Church ; they are not two but one Sacrifice. It is true that this contemplates the Ideal Church—the Church that is to be at the end of the ages ; a very different Church from the actual Church as we see Her now, while the tares are still growing with the wheat. Yet the Eye of God, as it were, looks through the long ages to the end and sees Her only as She is *now* found in Jesus Christ, and will be actually in Herself at the last.

The Christian Sacrifice is not therefore to be confined to one single act in the life of Jesus Christ. It is a drama including a long and complex series of acts in which Christ and His Church are concerned, beginning with the Incarnation,[1] continued by the life of perfect obedience, by Calvary, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Perpetual Work of the great High Priest in the Heavenly Temple, " ever living to make intercession for us " : taken up on earth by His Body, the Church, from the moment of Her Birth and carried on by Her dedicated life of act and suffering as She

[1] " Beginning with the Incarnation," did we say ? Can we take Sacrifice still further back into the Eternity of the Inner Life of the Blessed Trinity ? There from Eternity is Love, and the essence of Love is Self-giving. Is not self-giving in turn the Essence of Sacrifice ? Some, e.g. H. B. Jeaffreson (essay on the " Priesthood of Melchizedek," in the volume " The Doctrine of the Trinity ") speak of Sacrifice within the Bosom of the Godhead, each Person giving Himself to each in mutual Love. But as a matter of language, we use the word " Sacrifice" of a self-giving which involves suffering, self-denial, death, that is, self-giving as conditioned by sin (see R. C. Moberly, " Ministerial Priesthood," pp. 246–249 ; also " Atonement," pp. 245–248). It is best to confine the word " Sacrifice " to this form of self-giving ; otherwise it leads to confusion and needless controversy (see below, pp. 141–143.)

dies with Him to sin, rises again to righteousness, ascends to sit with Him on His Throne: including every single Offering made by each of Her members to God: beginning with the Incarnation and completed only with the end of time—one single indivisible Sacrifice: at once Sin Offering, Burnt Offering, Peace Offering fulfilled: nothing short of that is the Christian Sacrifice in its fullness.

NOTE

THERE is one statement in this chapter which needs considerable qualification. On page 138 Gayford writes about Christ "In His case even the ordinary words 'Into Thy hands I *commend* my spirit', 'He *gave up* the Ghost' have an *active* significance, which could not be attached to any other human death". Such a statement must not be allowed to obscure the fact that Christ calls us to follow Him in this respect. Christ could say "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me and to finish His work." Yet nothing in the Gospels is more obviously clear than the reality of Christ's agony of temptation in the Garden of Gethsemane. His "Thy will be done" was a victory after a very hard-fought battle. He continued to the end to will the way which led to the Cross. Is not this one of the vital ways in which, by virtue of His achievement, He calls us to follow Him?

Even when Christians are not called to a voluntary death, a death of self-sacrifice, they are called to will their death when it is inevitable, when it comes in the ordinary way of old age or of illness. It will make all the difference to our spiritual condition at the last whether we will death or rebel against it. The crux of a Christian life is death to self and living unto God (see page 111): and for us to will death, when the time for it comes, and to commend our spirits to God, in entire dependence on God and utter trust in Him, is the one completely searching, as well as the final, test of our death to self and our living unto God. A man approaching his end might say to himself, "Here by *accepting* death I prove the reality of my Baptism as a burial together with Him and of every Communion as my fellowship with Him both in His sufferings and in His Resurrection."

It would be deplorable if Gayford's words on page 138 had the unintentional effect of obscuring the fact that Christ calls us in life and death to follow Him in commending our spirits to the Father. No such argument or implication is necessary to safeguard the voluntariness of Christ's action as the Offerer or Sacrificer.

D. C.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE

(A) AS FULFILLED IN JESUS CHRIST

WE are now for a time to isolate in thought the Sacrifice of Christ from the Christian Sacrifice in the fullest sense as it appeared in the last chapter, and to contemplate the perfect ideal of Sacrifice as fulfilled by Him.

His is the Perfect Sacrifice. It is well to remind ourselves at the outset of one consequence of this. His Sacrifice is the norm, the measure, the standard for all other Sacrifices ; the degree of truth and value in all other forms of Sacrifice can only be gauged by comparison with His. They are to be explained by reference to His, not His by reference to them. Postulating as we did from the outset (pp. 3, 4) a belief in the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the historical development of Sacrifice, we have seen in all its forms things which pointed forward to the Lamb of God. Consciously or unconsciously we have all along anticipated this chapter : His Sacrifice has been our standard of judgment throughout. We shall now turn to that Sacrifice and try to see wherein its perfection consists.

A Perfect Sacrifice must be perfect in all the elements which constitute a Sacrifice. There must be the three

agents—Sacrificer, Victim, Priest. Three, not two only as some seem to think when they leave out of sight the person of the Sacrificer, and with what loss and confusion, as we shall see, to their whole conception of Sacrifice. Then, each of the three agents must be perfect of his kind—inwardly, in the heart and its intentions ; outwardly, in the life of act and suffering ; and lastly, by true commission from God, authorizing him for the office he fulfils. Finally, the " ceremonial " of Sacrifice, its " outward and visible sign," the acts by which the inward intention is expressed, must be worthy and adequate to express the great inward spiritual realities. Let us consider the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ in the light of these requirements.

(1) He combines in His own Person the three offices of Sacrificer, Victim, and Priest. The passages which reveal Him as Sacrificer are those which dwell on the voluntariness of His Sacrificial Death, and particularly such a passage as St. John x. 17, 18 : " I lay down My life . . . . . No one taketh it away from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it up again." It will be noticed that here is something more than the passive willingness to allow His life to be taken away from Him, such as we see, e.g., in the " not as I will but as thou wilt " of Gethsemane, or the " obedience unto death " of Phil. ii. 8. His Dying and even His Resurrection are described as the results of a deliberate *act of will* on His part : He *wills* to lay down His life and He *wills* to take it up again. It is His own deliberate act ; the outcome of His perfect obedience to the Father, but nevertheless His own act and not

another's. In His case, even the ordinary words "Into Thy Hands I *commend* My Spirit," "He *gave up* the Ghost" have an *active* significance, which could not be attached to any other human death.

The office of Victim is so frequently expressed or implied of Jesus Christ in the New Testament as hardly to need particular mention. It is contained in the title "Lamb of God"; it is implied wherever the thought is expressed that it was *Himself* that He offered and not another (e.g. Mark x. 45; Heb. ix. 12, 25, *et passim*). We may say, indeed, that while the passages describing His Death as actively the result of His own Will reveal Him especially as Sacrificer, in those which dwell on the aspect of passive self-surrender we see Him regarded as the Victim. But equally to the active and to the passive side of His Death belongs the *completeness of the obedience*, and it is that which makes Him both Perfect Sacrificer and Perfect Victim (*cf.* Heb. x. 8 ff). What a contrast is here between the calm deliberate resolve of Calvary and the scene presented—try to imagine it, Reader—at the slaughtering of the Victim in the Jewish Sacrifices; its wild terror, its unwillingness to die, the cruel force and violence with which its desperate struggles were overcome. But besides the willingness of the Victim there is another point of contrast to be noted. The life of an animal is no equivalent for the life of a man. But here the life which the human Sacrificer offers is not only a human life—it is human life in its ideal perfection. And, to crown all, the surrender of self is not only complete—it is made also at the greatest possible cost to the giver. It is no

costless obedience but the climax of uttermost self-sacrifice that we see wrought out in Gethsemane and on Calvary.

For the truth of Our Lord's Priesthood we need only refer to the Epistle of the Hebrews (see especially Heb. ii. 17—iii. 6, iv. 14—v. 10, vi. 20—x. 25). Divinely appointed to this office He was trained by suffering in the sympathy towards man (Heb. ii. 18, iv. 15 to v. 2) and obedience towards God (Heb. v. 8–10), which are the inward marks of a perfect Priest; towards God, a Son (Heb. vii. 28); towards His fellow-man, a man and a brother (Heb. ii. 11–14). Lastly, by Divine dispensation, the Priesthood conferred on Him "after the order of Melchizedek" is a greater than the Aaronic Priesthood of the Old Dispensation. Not only is His Offering a better one, but His Tenure of Office is eternal and immutable: He has no successor (Heb. vii. 23 ff). And His Priestly office is executed not in an earthly Tabernacle "made with hands" but in the "true Tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man," "eternal in the Heavens."

(2) In regard to the outward expression, the acts, of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, there is another essential difference to be noted from the Sacrifices of the Law. So long as Sacrificer and Victim were personally distinct there was an unbridged gap between the outward expression of Sacrifice and its inward intention. The two were accomplished within distinct and imperfectly related planes of consciousness. The feelings and desires of the heart belonged to the human sacrificer, but the doings and sufferings were those of the animal victim. Two lives, two "per-

sonalities," we might almost say---certainly two wills disunited and at variance—were involved. But now the Sacrificer and His Victim are one and the same. A breach of harmony is repaired. The outward expression is not merely ceremonial and symbolical; it stands in real and vital relation to the inward intention.

In every way His is therefore the Perfect Sacrifice; and for this reason it is one only, and once only offered. It is all-sufficient and therefore *needs not* to be repeated. It is Heaven's last word, God's last offer to man, and therefore it *cannot* be repeated: "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14).

It remains for us now to consider the acts by which this intention of the Perfect Sacrifice found true and worthy expression in act and suffering.

1. The whole Life of Jesus Christ from its earliest conscious moment was throughout its course a living Sacrifice. Like the Burnt Offering of old it was the offering of a dedicated life to fulfil the will of God. That was His "meat and drink." It was the fulfilment of the Burnt Offering. But this obedience was not a will-less or painless Offering. He was tempted in all points like as we are. He "learned obedience," and the self-surrender involved was a foreshadowing of His Death and its fulfilment of the Sin Offering. Or, looking at it from the point of view of the Sin Offering, we may regard the earthly life as the preparation for the Sacrifice, and compare it to the rearing of the victim for the Old Sacrifices.

2. *Calvary.* In one sense the Death of Jesus Christ was the culminating expression of that spirit of surrender and obedience which marked His whole life. His death was the supreme test of that self-surrender, but the difference between it and the rest of His life from this standpoint was one of degree, not of kind. Some writers on the Atonement[1] insist strongly that this is the whole of the truth : the Cross is the proof of an obedience " unto Death " ; it is not to be isolated in any way from the life of which it is the climax. But if due weight is given to all the references in the New Testament to the significance of the Cross, and to the " Blood " of Jesus, this view of His Death cannot be accepted as sufficient. It is a Christian, not a Jew, who quotes and applies to the Christian Sacrifice the words, " Apart from the shedding of blood there is no remission." There is a real danger, in our reaction from Calvinism, that we should underestimate the essential and central place of the Death in our Lord's Sacrifice. It is quite true that in the offering of the Blood, i.e. after the Death, we are to see the moment of the making of Atonement. But we must not forget that the Death was an essential condition for this Offering. Death and the offering of the Blood are both essential, and equally central in the Sacrifice of Christ.

His Death was essential ; " it behoved the Christ to suffer " ; but *why* this Divinely decreed necessity ? The answer is—because of sin (see, e.g., Rom. iv. 25 ; Gal. iii. 13 ; Heb. ix. 28 ; 1 Pet. iii. 18). It was sin

[1] E.g. Sabatier, " The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought," p. 220.

which made it necessary that the suffering of death should have a place in the Offering made by Jesus to the Father. But there are two ways of looking at this truth: (*a*) It was the hatred of sinful men that nailed Him to the tree. The more faithfully He carried out His mission the more inevitable became the hostile opposition of human sinfulness. Priest and Pharisee embody for the moment the permanent sinfulness of the whole race in opposition to the Will of God. We may justly say that so it was the sins of the world that crucified Christ. But, in this light, how would His Death differ from that of any other martyr? Their sufferings were also the natural result of a faithful witness for God in a sinful world. The connexion between sin and the Cross goes deeper than this. (*b*) "It *behoved* the Christ to suffer," "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." The forgiveness of sin demanded the Death of the Christ; nothing short of that could be sufficient. Continually in the New Testament "the Cross" or "the Death" or "the Blood" of Jesus are mentioned as the means by which we are delivered from our sins; for a few instances see, e.g., Rom. v. 10; Eph. ii. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 18; Col. i. 20–22. It is by His Death that we are justified. His Sacrifice was a "Sacrifice for sin" (Heb. x. 12), and therefore Death had a unique place in it. We have to remember again that the ultimate cause of His Death was Himself: "I lay down My life of Myself: no man taketh it from Me." The laws of cause and effect might be the instruments and wicked men the agents, but the first cause was the Will of God. It was the Divine decree that the Son of God

must suffer Death before the sins of men could be forgiven. The teaching of the Bible from beginning to end emphasizes the connexion between Death (i.e. the bitterness of Death, the "sting of Death") and sin (see, e.g., Gen. ii. 17, iii. 3, 19; 1 Cor. xv. 56; Rev. xx. 14). It was divinely ordained under the Old Covenant that Death must have a place in all atoning Sacrifices, and we cannot make the Death a mere incident in that of the New. Nor is the meaning of Death in this connexion far to seek. It is the expression of a contrition which reaches to the utmost limit of self-renunciation. Sacrifice offered under the condition of a nature rooted in selfishness (i.e. under the conditions of sin) must involve a *mortifying* of the natural man; only so can the offering of self to God be fulfilled. And to lay down one's life, to submit to physical death, has always been felt to be the highest expression of such a self-renunciation. We can understand that such an entire self-forgetting, so complete a self-sacrifice, would be the only adequate recompense that man could make for sin, the only real atonement between himself and God. So it is that "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." The root of all sin is self-seeking; the undoing of sin must therefore be accomplished by self-renunciation, i.e. death.

It must be observed, however, that this "laying down of life" is essentially distinct from that involuntary death, which is the *penalty* of sin (Gen. ii. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 56; Rev. xx. 14). Such a Death as this is the absolute opposite of the separation from God, which is the essence of the penal death.[1] This is the

[1] See F. W. Robertson, "Sermons" (People's Ed.), 2nd series, p. 92.

voluntary self-separation from sin in order to live nearer to God. The fruit of it is not death-bringing, but life-giving, both for Christ Himself and for others as well. The Crucifixion has for its necessary sequel the Resurrection, and the Risen Lord quickens others also. We pass on then from the Death to :

3. The Resurrection. From the analogy of the Old Covenant, in which the offering of the Blood was so vital a feature in Sacrifice, we should expect that the Christian Sacrifice would not close with the Crucifixion but be continued in the Risen Life of the Saviour. This expectation is justified, when we examine the New Testament teaching. Professor W. Milligan[1] has collected and examined the passages treating of the Blood of Jesus Christ, its meaning and efficacy, and compared with them the corresponding sayings in reference to His Death. The conclusion which he draws is that when the Apostolic writers wished to describe the full effects of the atoning work of Christ they almost invariably prefer to speak of His Blood, rather than His Death, as the means by which He won salvation for us. We need not remind our readers that the word " Blood " in itself involves the idea of Sacrifice. It was by a Sin Offering that Atonement was made under the New Covenant as under the Old. But further, " Blood," in its sacrificial associations, refers particularly to something which took place after the victim's death, i.e. to the altar-transaction, the " pouring " or " putting " or " sprinkling " of the Blood. Also the blood itself was the

[1] " Resurrection of Our Lord," Appendix to note 56, pp. 290–304.

symbol of the life that *had been through death*, i.e. the risen life. So, the "Blood of Christ" refers us to a *sacrificial* work belonging to the *Resurrection-life*. His offering of the blood is fulfilled by something which he does in his Resurrection-state and with His Risen Life. What that action is we must enquire when we come to speak of the Ascension. Meanwhile, it is enough to have established this very significant fact that the "Blood of Jesus" implies a reference to His Risen Life and a place for the Resurrection in the Sacrifice which He offered for the sins of the world.[1] This explains St. Paul's insistence on the Resurrection as an integral part of the atonement (e.g. Romans iv. 25, v. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 17).

4. The Ascension. We pass now to the work of the Ascended Lord in Heaven and the questions which arise in connexion with it. Does it form part of His Sacrifice? What is its relation to His Death? Closely connected with these questions is the doctrine of Our Lord's Priesthood. When did He enter upon this Priesthood? Where is the scene, and what is the time of its exercise? The answer to these questions is to be found chiefly in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the evidence of that Epistle has been interpreted in three different ways:

(1) The first view is that Our Lord was already the High Priest during His earthly life, and that the sacrificial part of His Priestly work was completed with His Death. The Priestly work in the Ascended Life is confined to pleading by a Sacrifice finished

[1] See further, Sanday and Headlam, "Romans," note on Chap. III, verse 25, and excursus on pp. 91 f.

" once and for all " on Calvary. This is the ordinary " Evangelical " or " Protestant " view of the Sacrifice of Christ, but it may also be fairly called the ordinary " Roman " view as well, in so far as it is implied in the common expression (as old as St. Ambrose), " the altar of the Cross." The *ara crucis* is mentioned in the definition of the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Council of Trent, and Our Lord is described as the Melchizedekian High Priest, there and then offering Himself in bloodywise to the Father. Any continuation of this Sacrifice is to be seen in the Eucharist, and the idea of a Priestly Offering in Heaven does not appear in the utterances of the Council. But Roman writers often speak of a Priestly Offering in Heaven as belonging to Our Lord's Sacrifice.[1] The ordinary " Roman " position does not deny—it merely overlooks the sacrificial work of the Heavenly High Priest. The keystone of the " Protestant " position, however, is the conviction that the Sacrifice offered by Our Lord was completed by His Death, and therefore to speak of the work of the Heavenly High Priest as sacrificial is to depreciate the unique value of the Cross. (A well-known book on the " Catholic " side, Mortimer's " Eucharistic Sacrifice," on the same grounds denies the reality of the Heavenly Sacrifice, but this part of his argument is vitiated by many inaccuracies and confusions). For an exposition of the " Protestant " position see Tait, " Heavenly Session of Our Lord."

There are two passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews

[1] E.g. Manning, " Eternal Priesthood," p. 4; De Condren, " Eternal Sacrifice," pp. 59–61.

which are constantly quoted as conclusive proof of this position, viz., (1) " Who . . . when He had made purification of sins, sat down . . . " (Heb. i. 3); and (2) when He had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down. . . ." (Heb. x. 12). Taken by themselves, apart from the Epistle as a whole, these words might well seem conclusive, and it must be granted that in any case it is not easy to fit them into the framework of thought to which we have been led by our study of the Old Testament Sacrifices and of Our Lord's Death and Resurrection. They remain, I frankly own, a difficulty. But to take the general Protestant interpretation of them and to make them dominate the whole Epistle raises other and by far greater difficulties. In particular it stultifies the comparison in Chapter IX between the Jewish High Priest's work in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement and Our Lord's work in the Heavenly Tabernacle. If the former is not merely Priestly but also Sacrificial (i.e. forming an integral part of the Sacrifice), how can it be contended that the same is not true of the latter as well? The evidence of the Epistle to the effect that the Melchizedekian Priesthood belongs to Our Lord's Ascended and Heavenly Life, and that He was appointed to this Priestly Office at the Ascension or the Resurrection, is so clear and strong that nearly all commentators are agreed on the point. Some of them, nevertheless, feeling compelled to claim for Our Lord the Priestly Office and the Priestly work during His earthly life, have conceived the strange idea of a double Priesthood, or two Priesthoods—an earthly Aaronic and a Heavenly Melchizedekian Office.

This is the second line of interpretation which we will now consider.

(2) *The double Priesthood.*—The motive for this idea, as we have just seen, is the supposed necessity that the Death upon the Cross must be regarded as a *Priestly* work. The idea of a Double Priesthood is not by any means new in Christian Theology. It dates back to the fourth century.[1] The attempt to see in the earthly Priesthood an anti-type to the Aaronic is comparatively modern. It is familiar to English readers chiefly through two books—Professor Bruce's "Humiliation of Christ" and Bishop Westcott's "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews." How far does the Epistle countenance such an idea? It says nothing, of course, about a "Priesthood after the Order of Aaron" being held by Our Lord. It says a good deal, on the other hand, which seems inconsistent with such a Priesthood. The whole burden of the Epistle is the *contrast* between His Priesthood and the Aaronic, in regard to its nature, its tenure, its work, and its power. Melchizedek, not Aaron, was the Old Testament type of this great High Priest. Such a passage as Heb. vii. 11–14 seems quite plainly to rule out the idea of an Aaronic Priesthood. The earthly Jesus was of the Tribe of Judah, "from which no man hath given attendance at the altar": "As to which Tribe Moses spake nothing concerning Priests." Jesus is described as "another Priest . . . after the Order of Melchizedek, and not . . . reckoned after the order of Aaron." And the whole idea of an earthly Priesthood is excluded by

[1] See Bruce, "Humiliation of Christ," pp. 279–283.

the words of Heb. viii. 4: "If He were on earth, He would not be a Priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law." Two Priesthoods cannot exist side by side at the same time. The one has superseded the other and that other has no longer any validity or reality.

At the bottom of this misunderstanding is the supposed necessity of maintaining that the Death on the Cross must be a Priestly act if the Cross was a Sacrifice.[1] But to a Christian Jew of the first century, A.D.—and to such the Epistle was addressed—no such necessity would exist. He was perfectly familiar with the fact that in the old Sacrifices the Priest's part began with the offering of the blood, and that the slaying of the Victim was the work of the *Sacrificer*; also that even if in a public Sacrifice the Priest slew the Victim, he did so as representing the Offerer and not *qua* Priest. It would be quite in accord with the Jewish view of Sacrifice that Our Lord should enter on the Priestly part of His Sacrificial Work after His Death. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the whole of this unfortunate confusion has sprung from our overlooking the person and work of the sacrificer in a Sacrifice. That Our Lord's Death was sacrificial we should vehemently assert; but because it was His work as Sacrificer laying down His life of Himself, and not because it was a Priestly act. The exercise of the Priestly office is to be seen in those acts which correspond to the presenting of

[1] Even Professor G. Milligan ("Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," p. 129), while contending against the Doctrine of the Double Priesthood, calls it "satisfactory as enabling us to bring Our Lord's Death . . . under His High Priestly service."

the Victim's blood and its body, and these acts presuppose the Death as an accomplished fact; indeed, without the Death that has gone before, they would be valueless and even impossible. That Heaven should be the scene, and the Risen and Ascended Life the time, of the Priestly work is the only condition that satisfies the truth of the Sacrifice.

(3) *The heavenly Priesthood.*—Let us turn now to the evidence of the Epistle that Our Lord entered upon His Priestly Office—or at any rate, upon the exercise of that office, on His Priestly Work—at the Ascension. We have already dealt with the teaching of Heb. vii. 11–14 and viii. 4, 5, and found it conclusive against any other view but this.[1] The chief passages on the positive side are Heb. v. 1–10, viii. 1–3, ix. 11, 12, 24–26. In the former, especially in verses 7–10, is described the preparation of Our Lord for His Priesthood—a preparation of human sympathy and obedience to God; then, the struggle over and the victory won, "having been made perfect," He was "named [or "proclaimed"] of God a High Priest." With this we may compare Heb. vi. 20: "Whither [i.e. "within the veil" into Heaven] as a forerunner Jesus entered for us, having become a High Priest." The second passage (Heb. viii. 1–3) shows us Our Lord, like Melchizedek, as King sitting upon His Throne (verse 1) and also as ministering Priest in the Heavenly Sanctuary (verse 2), engaged in offering both "Gifts and Sacrifices" (i.e. the *minḥah* and the *zebaḥim*, verse 3). In Heb. ix. an elaborate parallel is drawn between the duties of the Aaronic High Priest on the

[1] See pp. 148 f.

Day of Atonement (verses 1–8) and those of our High Priest in Heaven (verses 11, 12, 24, 25). [For the significance of the apparent confusion between the Day of Atonement (verses 1–8) and the Inaugural Covenant Sacrifice of Exod. xxiv. (verses 15–21), see pp. 78-79]. The full significance of the parallel appears most clearly when presented in the following tabular form. Each column should be read downwards :—

Old.	*New.*
The Aaronic Priest (v. 7) ..	The true Priest (v. 11).
Once each year (v. 7) ..	once for all (v. 12).
entered the Holy of Holies (v. 7)	entered the true Holy Place, i.e. Heaven itself (v. 24 ; *cf.* v. 11, if παραγενόμενος means the same as the "appearing" of v. 24).
and offered the blood of another (vv. 7, 12)	to appear before the Face of God for us (v. 24), which is explained in v. 25 as "to offer Himself" (*cf.* v. 14)

It will be seen that in both cases *the Death of the Victim* is presupposed as an already accomplished fact

before *the Priestly work is begun.* The Heavenly Sanctuary with the Heavenly *Shechinah* (verse 24) is the scene of the Priestly Ministry ; the entry into that Sanctuary marks the time of His Ascension into Heaven, where He will abide until His Second Coming (verses 25–28 ; *cf.* Acts i. 11).

It will be noticed that Our Lord is said outright in verse 25 to " offer Himself " in the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the same phrase is used in verse 14, where it may, however, and perhaps does, refer to the Sacrificer's offering of self (i.e. the Death on the Cross). In verse 12 the writer seems to be on the verge of saying, " Christ offered [not the blood of goats and calves, as the Aaronic High Priest did, but] His Own Blood." It is evident that He avoided the actual words as being liable at the time to a physical, materialistic misconstruction.[1] But the expression, though not actually found in the Epistle, is completely justified by its teaching. In verse 24 this offering of Himself is called " to appear before the Face of God." The word ἐμφανισθῆναι, an unexpected word, means " to be made clearly visible," so that he could not be overlooked, i.e. to be a " Lord's Remembrancer " a " memorial " before God of the Passion and Death, the marks of which He bears. The underlying thought is the same as that of Rev. v. 6 : " I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures and of the elders [i.e. as Mediator between God and man] a Lamb standing [i.e. alive] as though it had been slain " (with the marks of His Passion upon Him). The sacrificial association is present, though latent, in the

[1] See Moberly, " Ministerial Priesthood," pp. 264–266.

Priest-Victim's " appearing." But also He is said " to appear before the Face of God *for us*," on our behalf. It is a mediatorial Offering of Himself. The words link this Sacrificial Offering with the Heavenly intercession of Heb. vii. 25 ; Rom. viii 34, and in turn we are reminded that the word " intercession " (ἐντυγχάνειν) is wide enough to include the thought of a sacrificial Offering for others.[1]

From the foregoing discussion it is clear that the general teaching of the Epistle is as follows :—

(1) Our Lord has but one Priesthood—after the order of Melchizedek.

(2) He entered upon the exercise of that Priesthood (if not upon the office itself, as Heb. v. 5 and 10 seems to imply) *after* His Death.

(3) The scene of His Ministry is the Heavenly Temple.

(4) He offers Himself, His Blood ; and this Priestly Offering is the anti-type to the offering of the Blood in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement.

This Offering is the true, complete, and final making of atonement for the sins of men ; therefore it is one only Offering and can never be repeated. But there is opened out before us here a far wider conception of the One Sacrifice than the common view which would confine it to the Death on the Cross. The Sacrifice of Christ is One *in so far as He is Sacrificer and Victim*, as a completed act of past time, accomplished at the moment of His Death. That is the significance of

[1] See Westcott, Note on Heb. vii. 25 (p. 191), and W. Milligan, " The Ascension," p. 152.

the saying from the Cross, "It is finished." The source of the atoning power of His Sacrifice is the Cross, and the Cross alone. He "made there by His One Oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." The all-sufficiency of the Cross is the keystone of His Sacrifice. But it is also One Sacrifice in so far as He is the Priest, in that He entered "once for all" (Heb. ix. 12) into the Heavenly Holy of Holies, there to offer Himself for us. There can be but one Priestly entry just as there can be but one Death of the Victim.

It is often said that Our Lord's "appearing" for us, His "intercession," represents Him as pleading by a Sacrifice which was past and over with the Crucifixion. But against this we have to urge (*a*) this pleading is integral to the Sacrifice, and, as in the Jewish worship, it represents the Priest's function in a Sacrifice; (*b*) the "appearing" is identified with the offering of Himself, which, like the offering of the Blood on the Mercy Seat, is sacrificial. If, however, those who hold this position would allow that there is this Heavenly Offering (as surely they must do) the difference between us and them would become merely a verbal difference in the definition and use of terms. It might well happen that a long controversy should be concluded by a mutual agreement to speak of *Sacrifice* (referring to the Death) and *Offering* (in reference to the Priestly Work), provided it were understood that these were two parts of one undivided act. It is because the word *Sacrifice* is generally used to cover

the whole act that I should prefer to retain it in this wider sense ; [1] but that is not essential.[2]

One final point remains to be discussed with reference to the Heavenly Offering. Does the Epistle to the Hebrews regard that Offering as a completed act of past time or as a continued action, such as is implied in the phrase, "the perpetual offering"? The answer really turns upon the meaning of the passages, Heb. i. 3, vii. 27, x. 12–14. It is not possible to regard the last passage at least as a reference to the Sacrificer's part in the Sacrifice which was completed with the Death. Heb. x. 12–14, and possibly the other two passages, refer to the Priest's work, and, if so must be taken to imply that the Offering made at the moment of the entry was then completed, and followed by the Session on the Throne. The Priest Who stood to make His Offering, sat on His Throne as King when that Offering was finished. If so, there is a verbal inconsistency with other passages which regard the Offering as perpetually being made in the Sanctuary. Such, as we have seen, is Heb. viii. 1–3, where the two ideas—the Session as King and the Ministry as Priest—are regarded as *present* facts; and the justification for this, as to the Priestly Ministry, is that "it is necessary that this High Priest also have somewhat to offer" (the aorist as usual in the subjunctive is timeless).[3] The same truth is involved in

[1] See above, pp. 2, 24.

[2] Professor Swete in a private letter suggests the value of retaining the two terms with distinction as above: "Sacrifice" representing the Biblical *θυσία* and "Offering" *προσφορα*

[3] See J. H. Moulton, "Greek Grammar" (1906), p. 134; G. Milligan, "Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," p. 142.

the words " Eternal Spirit " in Heb. ix. 14, and in the emphatic "*now* [i.e. "at this present moment"] to appear for us " in Heb. ix. 24. Both passages imply " a manifestation which is both one and unceasing."[1] With this agrees, too, the vision of the Lamb in Rev. v. 6, and the perpetual Intercession of Hebrews vii. 25, Romans viii. 34.

After all, either of these conceptions expresses a truth. At the first moment of the entry into Heaven the Sacrifice was completed and the atonement made ; it needed neither reinforcement nor renewal. Yet, on the other hand, in Him Humanity for ever makes before God its Offering of self. Probably, to the author of our Epistle, sometimes the one and sometimes the other truth was present in his mind, and not being aware of long subsequent controversies, he expressed himself according to the thought of the moment without noting any inconsistency. It is going too far to say that he regards all the acts of the Sacrifice, the Cross, and the Priestly Work as eternal and therefore timeless. This idea is too philosophical for him, and it is certain that he does conceive of a time-sequence in the order of the Sacrifice, corresponding to the sequence in the Sacrifices of the Old Covenant. The One Sacrifice is presented before our eyes in the form of a drama beginning with the Incarnation and continuing until the end of time : one, not in the sense of one action within certain circumscribed limits of past time, but in the sense of one continuous act—never repeated, because always going on till the end of the world. Christ " is a Priest for ever, not by

[1] Moulton, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews," *ad loc.*

a perpetual series of acts of memory, not by multiplied and ever-remoter acts of commemoration of a death that is past, but by the eternal presentation of a life which is eternally the 'life that died.'"[1]

[1] Moberly, "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 246. The New Testament describes Our Lord as engaged *after His Death* in doing three things with His Blood: (1) By it He "cleanses," "washes," "looses," us from our sins (1 John i. 7; Heb. ix. 14; Titus ii. 14; Rev. vii. 14, i. 5). (2) He gives It to us in the Sacrament. (3) He offers It upon the Heavenly Altar. No one doubts that the first two of these describe actually present facts—they are perpetual actions. Is there any reason why the same should not be true of the third as well? The Blood is the Life: It is the Living Christ Himself, Who by His touch cleanses, washes us, and gives Himself to be our Food. It is the same Christ Who, *because* He is Living with a Human Life, must ever be doing that which is essential to the creature's relation to the Creator, i.e. offering Himself to Him. But for the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews in view of temporary conditions refrains from using direct sacrificial language the truth of the Perpetual Offering would not have been overlooked or disputed.

CHAPTER IX

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE

(B) AS FULFILLED IN THE CHURCH'S LIFE AND WORSHIP

I MUST remind the reader, at this stage, of the subject-matter of Chapter VII. We spoke there of the dedicated Life of the Church as Her Burnt Offering, Her share in the Christian Sacrifice in dependence upon and union with the One Sacrifice of Her Lord. The dedication of the whole life (Rom. xii. 1; *cf. ibid.* vi. 13; Hebrews xiii. 15; 2 Cor. ii. 14, 15), every single good deed and every exercise of virtue (e.g. acts of charity [Heb. xiii. 16; Phil. iv. 18]), on the part of the Church corporately and of Her individual members separately, make up Her Burnt Offering, which rises unceasingly from Earth to Heaven; but always in union with the One Offering of Her Lord—acceptable only in Him, possible only through Him (1 Pet. ii. 5). "This [i.e. the life of good works] is the Sacrifice of Christians: we being many are one Body in Christ; and this also is the Sacrifice which the Church continually celebrates in the Sacrament of the Altar . . . in which She teaches that She Herself is offered in the Offering She makes to God." [1] St. Paul speaking of his apostolic ministry depicts himself

[1] St. Augustine, "De Civitate Dei," X, vi.

as a sacrificing Priest (ἱερουργοῦντα) presenting to God as his Offering the Gentile Church in its sanctified life (Rom. xv. 16; the same thought is latent in 2 Cor. xi. 2). Very instructive, too, in this connexion is the train of thought in Heb. x. 19–25. There we have a picture which embraces the whole Christian Sacrifice throughout the ages. The Church is admitted through the veil into the Heavenly Sanctuary (verses 19, 20); there She beholds Her Great High Priest engaged in His Work of offering Himself (verse 21); She is bidden to "draw near," i.e. to join with Him in that Offering, in Her Baptismal Robe of Faith and Purity (verse 22); and Her share in the Offering is the exercise of Faith, Hope, Love, Good Works, and Worship (verses 23–25).

In that passage, as perhaps nowhere else,[1] there is set forth the Christian Sacrifice in its fullness: the Sacrifice of the Lord Himself through His Incarnate Life and Death, His Ascended Life and Heavenly Priesthood, taken up and made Her own by His Church in dedicated life and worship; Sin and Burnt and Peace Offering perfected; the Law not destroyed but "fulfilled."

It remains for us to speak of that Sacrifice as expressed in Christian Worship. The function of worship is to gather up and focus in one intense moment the whole Godward side, in all its parts, of the daily life. And if Sacrifice be co-extensive with life—as it must be, if the definition of Sacrifice as

[1] Another interesting passage is Heb. xiii. 10–16, where, again, we have the Sacrifice of Christ and the Church linked together as making up the fullness of the Christian Sacrifice: its aspects as Sin Offering, Burnt Offering, Peace Offering: and the relation of dedicated life to worship.

"the exercise of love within the atmosphere of sin" (p. 143) be a true description—then it must be co-extensive with worship also. Every side of worship—prayer, praise, thanksgiving, confession of sin, confession of faith, adoration—is an Offering of the soul to God; the "lifting-up of the hands" is a "Sacrifice" (Ps. cxli. 2). For this reason, if for no other, the one distinctive and Divinely ordained act of Christian worship, which incorporates all the elements of worship—the Eucharist—must be a Sacrifice.

But the sacrificial action in the Eucharist is more particular and special than this, because it is linked very closely and very definitely with Calvary and the Heavenly Priesthood. It is in the nature of that link that the true conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is to be found. Let us consider first the *fact* of that link and then enquire into its nature.

I. Let us recall the scene of the Institution. At the Last Supper Our Lord anticipated two events which had not yet happened.[1] He spoke of His coming Death as a *present* fact: "My Body which *is being given*." "My Blood which *is being shed*." The present participles (διδόμενον and ἐκχυνόμενον) are emphatic by their very unexpectedness. Also, He stood there in the rôle, not only of Sacrificer and Victim, but also of Priest to His Church; He anticipated the Heavenly Priesthood as well as Calvary. The moment at which he places Himself, so to speak, is after the Ascension; the Communion proper, like the meal in the Peace Offering, follows after the Death and the Presenting of the Blood.

[1] See Gore, "Body of Christ," note 19, p. 315.

But in saying this we are assuming the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Let us proceed to justify this by pointing to the various sacrificial features in its institution.

(1) First, there is its *connexion with the Passover.* Whether the Last Supper was actually the Passover meal or not, there is no doubt that Our Lord intended to connect the two together in the Disciples' minds. Passover night or not, it was to be *their* Passover Supper. The Passover was a primitive Sacrifice of the nature of a Peace Offering. The meal was a part of the Sacrifice. The expression "a feast upon a Sacrifice" is misleading if by it a separation is implied between this and the other acts which made up the Sacrifice of a Peace Offering. At the back of the expression lies no doubt the false and mischievous identification of Sacrifice with death and death alone.

(2) Our Lord's acts and words would remind the Jewish Disciples that they were being called upon to take part in a Sacrifice. He took Bread and Wine, the materials of the *minḥah*; He spoke of them in terms of Body and Blood, the objects of Offering in the animal Sacrifices (*zebaḥim*); He called them His own Body and Blood, identifying Himself with the Victim in the Sacrifice. Leaving aside the question whether the word "given" (Luke xxii. 20; *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 24) was actually used by Him,[1] He spoke of His Blood as "outpoured" (ἐκχυνόμενον). The mention of "Blood" and (in lesser degree) of "Body" would in

[1] In any case it expresses the exact truth and is strongly supported by John vi. 51.

itself show the Disciples that it was a Sacrifice He was thinking of. To speak to a Jew of "blood" in a religious connexion would at once suggest this. The idea would be clinched by the "shed" or "outpoured," recalling the moment of the slaughtering of the Victim.[1] It is something to do with the Blood now being shed and made available for further use, i.e. to the Blood *after* the Victim's Death which is pictured as taking place at the very moment of the Speaker's words.[2]

The mention of the "*New Covenant*" adds further particulars relating to Sacrifice. It is "the Blood of a Covenant Sacrifice," i.e. by which a Covenant is to be inaugurated. The "New Covenant" fulfils the promise of Jeremiah xxxi. 31 ff; the Blood of the Covenant is a direct reference to the Sacrifices by which the Old Covenant was established (Exod. xxiv. 5–11). Moses took the Blood of the Burnt and Peace Offerings and poured (not "sprinkled") it on the book containing the terms of the Covenant, on the altar and on the people. Jesus takes the Blood of the New Covenant and bids His people drink of it, receive into themselves its life-giving power. This takes us back to the primitive drinking of blood, which was afterwards succeeded by the pouring (as in Exod. xxiv).[3]

[1] It is fairly certain that the Greek ἐκχυνόμενον does not refer to the presentation of the blood upon the altar. If so, we should expect either "sprinkled" or "put" as in the Sin Offering. Also the word for "pouring" on the Altar is προσχύνειν; ἐκχεῖν is only used for a *non-sacrificial* pouring out of the blood at the base of the altar, as a reverent means of disposing of it (see p. 74).

[2] It should be remembered that the word "Blood" in itself denotes a life that *has passed* through death; the present participle does not mean that it is the Blood before or in the moment of death that Our Lord bade the Disciples to drink.

[3] The New Testament parallel with the "pouring" of the blood upon the people is found in other contexts, e.g. Heb. ix. 14; 1 John i. 7; Rev. vii. 14.

When we remember that it is the same blood of the same Sacrifice which is presented on the Heavenly Altar, we see there is the closest connexion implied between the Holy Communion and the Heavenly Offering, i.e. a sacrificial act.

Finally, we have to consider the sacrificial associations gathered around the words "*do* this" and "in memory of Me." The Hebrew *asâh* (= "do") and its Greek equivalent ποιεῖν (the word used here) in a sacrificial context often mean "to offer." It is almost certain that this is the meaning in St. Luke ii. 27, "to do [i.e. "offer"] concerning Him after the custom of the Law." The context in this case also is sufficiently sacrificial to make it a probable though not a certain conclusion that here too it bears the sacrificial meaning. If so, however, the point was lost to the Early Church, which almost universally interpreted the word in the simple sense "to do." But this is not conclusive against the other interpretation.[1] On the whole, the balance of probability is in favour of rather than against the meaning "to offer," but there is no certainty.

The words "in remembrance of Me" (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν) occur only in the earliest account of the Institution (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25; in St. Luke xxii. 19 they probably do not belong to the original text). The word ἀνάμνησιν is once only found in the LXX as a translation of the sacrificial *'Azkarah*,[2] for which the regular equivalent elsewhere is the kindred μνημόσυνον. It is used certainly once, and probably in two other

[1] As, e.g., Bishop Gore seems to think; "Body of Christ," note 20.

[2] See p. 29.

places, of a memorial before God, but its connexion with this idea cannot be called particularly strong. The same may be said of St. Paul's explanatory words, "Ye do *proclaim*" [καταγγέλλετε] the Lord's Death." The word καταγγέλλειν is used elsewhere in the New Testament always of preaching the Gospel to men, and that is the readiest sense in which to take it here. The Eucharist is the Church's witness to the Lord's Death, its meaning, and its power. In it She "remembers" Him and preaches Him to others. The "remembrance" before God is by no means excluded, but it is not primarily suggested, far less asserted, by the choice of such a word as καταγγέλλετε.

(3) The Communion itself, as we have seen (p. 37ff) must be regarded as a part of the Sacrifice—a fact sometimes obscured by the implied distinction between "Communion" and "Sacrifice" or "Offering." This fact was the more emphasized at the Last Supper by the very startling difference between the Peace Offering meal and the Christian Communion in the command, "This is My Blood: drink ye all of this." The Old Testament prohibition of Blood as a food was so emphatic and repeated, the Jewish abhorence of such an act so deep seated, that these words must have left the Disciples thunderstruck (*cf.* John vi. 52–60). But the very reason for which it was previously forbidden is the ground on which it is now commanded: "the blood is the *life* thereof." *Grace* and truth came by Jesus Christ: we have now a Grace-giving, a Life-giving Sacrifice.[1]

[1] Are we justified in supposing a distinction in the two gifts of the Body and the Blood? The separation and the interval which separated the two at the Institution seem to suggest a difference

(4) There are one or two passages outside the Gospels which must not be overlooked in this connexion. The Epistle to the Hebrews contains very little direct mention of the Sacraments.[1] The clearest reference to the Eucharist is in Heb. xiii. 10 ff. We (i.e. the Priestly Church as a whole) have an altar from which the Jewish Priesthood ("they that serve the Tabernacle") have no right to be fed. They are debarred, not only because they are not Christians, but also by the terms of their own Law. When the Sin Offering was made for another the sacrificing Priest received the flesh (except the fat) as his portion; but if the blood was brought into the Holy Place (i.e. if the Sin Offering was for himself or for the whole congregation, and therefore including himself) he was not allowed to eat of it, and the whole of the flesh except the fat was burnt outside the camp (Lev. vii. 11–14).[2] This, of course, was the case with the Sin Offerings on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 27), to which our passage directly refers as the Type of Our Lord's Sin Offering. But the Christian Sin Offering, unlike the Jewish, invites its Priesthood to feed upon

between them. The blessing of the Cup would hardly be separated from that of the Bread, if both were meant to convey precisely the same gift. The Jewish sacrificial distinction of *Body* and *Blood* points in the same direction. In the gift of the Sacred Body we receive His Perfected Sinless Human Nature and all that belongs to it, its attributes and virtues; in the Sacred Blood, the perfected quickened Risen Life which vivifies His Body. The two together make the complete gift of His Living Humanity; not a catalogue of virtues but a living Life, which embodies and expresses them. Regarded in this light, the withholding of the Chalice from the laity is seen to have a special gravity (see W. Milligan, "Resurrection of Our Lord," p. 288 (1st ed. 278) and Miss A. E. Peacock, "The Life Thereof."

[1] For the reasons, see G. Milligan, "Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," pp. 219 ff.

[2] See p. 82.

the Flesh of the Victim, not in a carnal, but after a "heavenly and spiritual" manner (*cf.* verse 9). The reference to the Priesthood and to the Day of Atonement and its Sin Offering confirm the interpretation which the word "altar" itself suggests. The purpose of an "altar" is that the Priest may offer upon it; this altar is in the Heavenly Sanctuary, on it our High Priest offers Himself, His Body, and His Blood, and from it we, the Christian Priesthood, receive our Priestly "portion" of the Body and the Blood. But if it is *our* altar, the implication is that *we* also in common with Him "draw near" to make an Offering there. Our earthly "altars" are but the visible counterpart of that One Altar in the Heavens.

In this passage Communion and Sacrifice are inextricably interwoven. It is also a precious Biblical witness to the "glorious interchange" of Heaven and earth in the Eucharist. All this is lost when the altar is regarded as the place of slaughter and identified with the Cross. It was probably from this passage so interpreted that the expression "*ara crucis*" arose. A truer conception and a richer vein of teaching are found in Irenæus,[1] and Origen[2] who place this Christian altar in the Heavenly Sanctuary. Origen, in particular,[3] identifies it with the "heavenly altar" of Revelation vi. 9. If (as is of course true) in Heb. x. 19–25 the prime reason for the "assembling of ourselves together" is the Breaking of the Bread, we have in that passage also the same interchange of Earth and Heaven and the same interweaving of Communion and Sacrifice as in Heb. xiii. 10 ff.

[1] IV, xviii. 6. [2] "Exhort. ad Martyrium," 30. [3] *Loc. cit.*

A passage closely linked with Heb. xiii. 10 and presenting the same association of Communion with Sacrifice is 1 Cor. x. 14–21. The Apostle is warning his converts of the danger of idolatry in eating meats that have been offered on idol altars, taken thence by heathen priests as their altar portion, and sold by them in the markets for common use. His argument is this: "Being fed from the Table of the Lord, you have Communion with the Lord. What is it if knowingly you get your food from heathen altars? Gentile beliefs and Jewish law should be a reminder and a warning to you" (verses 18–20). This is the context in which St. Paul speaks of the "Table of the Lord." The phrase, as we have seen (p. 78), comes from the Old Testament, where it means the "altar," and the idea associated with it is that of *Offering*. It is the "Table" on which man offers to God the "Bread of the Lord." From that "Lord's Table" the Priest received a portion for himself, and so he had communion with the altar" (verse 18). From the Christian "altar" on which the Great High Priest makes the Offering of His Body and Blood we, the Christian Priesthood, are fed. This "Table of the Lord" is the Heavenly Altar on which is made the Heavenly Offering, and it is with this train of ideas that the Holy Communion is linked. In that Sacrament there is an Offering made to God as well as a gift received from Him.

THE NATURE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

Our examination of passages expressing the *fact* of

a Eucharistic Sacrifice has already advanced us considerably on the way to a conception of its nature. We have at least reached the following conclusions :—

(1) The Sacrament is not merely a *present* Feast following upon a *past* Sacrifice, for the meal is an integral part of the Sacrifice.

(2) Further, the Eucharistic Sacrifice is not merely the Feast regarded as part of a Sacrifice ; it includes an Offering on our part as well as a Receiving.

(3) That which we offer is something more than the " Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving," if by that is meant " the fruit of lips which make confession to His Name." It includes that, of course ; but if that were all, the Eucharist would not differ from any other worship in its sacrificial aspect.

(4) Nor is it merely the offering of " ourselves, our souls, and bodies." The Evangelical will be the first to acknowledge that the offering of self can never be separated from the One Offering of Himself made by Our Lord ; that we are one with Him and He with us ; that in Him alone, as bound up with His Self-Oblation, can our Offering of self be acceptable to God. We pray that God will " only look on us as found in Him." This is true to all that is best in the Evangelical doctrine of Justification by Faith ; nay, we may go further and say that it is demanded by a consistent acceptance of that doctrine. But, when once this is granted, what momentous issues follow ! For it unites inseparably this our earthly offering of ourselves with the Heavenly Offering made by the Heavenly Priest on the Heavenly Altar in the Heavenly Sanctuary. The Church's myriad altars in all the world are one

with that Heavenly Altar, Her Priesthood is One with His. In offering Himself to God upon that Altar He offers His Church, the redeemed human race, for He is the "Son of Man." In offering ourselves to God we, the Priestly Church, cannot but be offering Him in Whom we all are gathered up. The reality of the Sacrifice is in Heaven, of which the Earthly is an image. The Sacrifice of the Mass is the same as that offered by Our Lord in Heaven.[1]

(5) It follows from this that the Eucharistic Sacrifice does not consist in the pleading of a Sacrifice which was completed at some past time (i.e. with the Death on the Cross). We have seen that the view which reduces the Heavenly Offering to this "pleading" is not true to the New Testament teaching. That Offering is a real Offering. So, too, the Eucharistic Offering, which is parallel, or rather identical, with this Heavenly Offering, is also a real Offering. It is not merely the pleading by a past and completed Sacrifice, but forms an integral part of that Sacrifice.

So much for the negative conclusions. But positively, also, we have arrived at this. In the Eucharist we are joined with Our Lord as He offers Himself upon the Heavenly Altar, and He unites Himself with us in our Offering. From time to time as the Sacrament is celebrated we enter through the veil into the Heavenly Temple and join in its unceasing Offering (Heb. x. 19 ff.). Earth is merged in Heaven, Time in Eternity, the Finite in the Infinite. This

[1] De Condren, "The Eternal Sacrifice," pp. 34, 101. *Cf.* St. Augustine, "De Civitate Dei," X, 6 (quoted above, p. 158), and other passages from St. Augustine quoted in Gore, "Body of Christ," pp. 204–209.

Heavenly interchange " is witnessed in the Liturgies by the *Sursum Corda* bidding us enter the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the *Sanctus*, in which we take our place in the " whole company of Heaven " and our part in the Angelic Worship. In regard particularly to the Eucharistic Offering the interchange is expressed in two ways :

(*a*) By the prayer that the earthly gifts may be borne by the hand of angels to the Heavenly Altar (so in the Roman Canon of the Mass).

(*b*) In the thought of the Christ coming down to be the Priest at the Earthly Altar : (*cf.* Dr. Bright's hymn, " And having with us Him that pleads above," and the striking words of Dr. Moule in the " Fulham Conference on Communion," p. 91, conveying the same idea, although with reference to the Communion and not to the Sacrifice).

We can now gather up the various expressions of sacrificial Offering in our Liturgy. Most of them are common to all the Liturgies and inherent in the most primitive type of Eucharistic Prayer.

(*a*) We take bread and wine—natural gifts—and offer them to God as a symbol that all we have is His and owed by us to Him.

(*b*) He accepts and blesses them and gives them back to us as the *Risen* Body and Blood of Christ. (N.B.—" Blood " in sacrificial sense always means a " Risen " life, one that has passed through death, but is alive).[1]

(*c*) Receiving them, we are made one with Our Lord, and also one with all the Faithful (i.e. we act

[1] See pp. 68, 144.

corporately as a Church, not singly as individuals or as congregations ; in every Eucharist it is the Church Catholic of all ages and all nations which offers the Sacrifice). So united, (1) we join with Him in His Perpetual Self-Oblation. This is represented in our Liturgy by the words " By the merits and death of Thy Son . . . and through Faith in His Blood " ; it is much to be desired, however, that a more direct recognition of this side of the Eucharistic Offering should be included in our Communion Service, bringing it back into line with the other Catholic Liturgies. Could an Evangelical, reading what we have said above (p. 168), object to such an inclusion ? (2) In Him and through Him we make our own Offering, laying it, as it were, upon His on the Heavenly Altar and uniting it with His.[1] As He in offering Himself to the Father offers us as well, so we in offering ourselves offer Him.

(*d*) This joint-offering of ours includes (1) the offering of Prayer ; hence the beautiful significance of the all-inclusive pattern of Prayer, the *Paternoster*, in the position it occupies in the Canon. (2) The " Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving " ; hence the name " Eucharist," itself a sacrificial term. (3) the offering of the dedicated life, " ourselves, our souls, and bodies." In this Offering we gather up the whole of life on all its sides—work and play and sleep, home and friendships, everything is here laid on the Heavenly Altar as our Eucharistic Gift. It is another of the

[1] A beautiful parallel has been noted in the Old Testament. The *Perpetual* public Burnt Offering lay on the Altar day and night so that the Offerings of individuals were laid upon it (Ex. xxix. 38–42 ; Lev. vi. 8–13).

glorious interchanges, a precious linking of worship to the everyday life.

. . . . .

We may conclude this review of the Eucharistic Sacrifice with a few disconnected notes.

(*A*) This conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice makes it the earthly parallel of Our Lord's Priestly Offering in Heaven. It is impossible here to review even in barest outline the history of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.[1] But this conception to which we have arrived, besides being based on the New Testament, has been represented continuously in the teaching of the Christian Doctors from the earliest times down to the present day. In the Roman Church it has come to be largely overshadowed by the view which sees in the Eucharistic Sacrifice a parallel to the Death upon the Cross. This conception, also an ancient one, seems to rest on two assumptions: (1) The Eucharist represents in itself the whole of a Sacrifice in all its parts, and therefore must include a parallel with the Lord's Dying. Our view, on the other hand, makes it represent one phase or stage of the drama of Sacrifice, viz. that which corresponds to the offering of the Body and the Blood upon the Altar. If we take this view we cannot with strict correctness speak of "the Eucharistic Sacrifice." The Eucharist is *sacrificial*, but not a whole Sacrifice. The term "Eucharistic Offering" expresses the exact truth and is in every way to be preferred to the other.

[1] For this see Darwell Stone, "History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist."

(2) Sacrifice implies "destruction."[1] We have endeavoured to show that both the killing of the victim and the burning of the body in the Jewish Sacrifices were associated with the idea of "more abundant life" rather than with the negative idea of destruction. By the killing, the blood became not less but more living; the altar fire was not a destroying but a purifying, etherializing agency.

Under the influence, conscious or unconscious, of these two ideas the Eucharist was thought to represent mainly the Death of Christ. There must be something in it which "should congruously represent the blow of the sacrificial knife,"[2] and this was found in the *separate* consecration of Bread and Wine, whereby "with bloodless cutting thou dividest the Body and Blood of the Lord, using thy voice as a sword."[3] "Thus we have the picture of the Cross of Calvary, and the very act that makes the picture constitutes the reality of the Sacrifice."[4] But apart from the question of what was intended by the interval between the blessing of the Bread and of the Cup at the Last Supper—whether it was merely occasioned by the ceremonial order of the Passover, or implied a difference in the underlying gifts[5] or a "bloodless cutting" (but what evidence can be offered for this last?)—it is

[1] Bishop Hedley (Roman Catholic Bishop of Newport) describes this as a part of the definition of Sacrifice accepted by Catholic theologians ("The Holy Eucharist," p. 151). He says, however (p. 160), "Some modern theologians have entirely discarded from the notion of Sacrifice all idea of destruction."

[2] Hedley, p. 164.

[3] Gregory Nazianzen, Epistle 171, addressed to Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium.

[4] Hedley, p. 165.

[5] See p. 164 note.

difficult to see how this view can really escape the charge of attempting to "repeat" (to "*re*-present" rather than "represent") the Death on the Cross. To speak of it as "mystical" or "sacramental" does not remove the difficulty. The other conception seems not only truer to the Gospel teaching but free from this difficulty. The Heavenly presentation and its counterpart, the Eucharistic Offering, both alike look back to Calvary, and rely entirely on the Cross for their reality and their saving power. This view is also represented—although not nearly so generally as the other—in modern Roman Catholic theology.[1]

(*B*) Our interpretation puts aside entirely any possibility of competition between the Cross and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. They are in no sense rivals—both belong to the One Sacrifice. To distinguish between the Cross as the propitiation for original sin and the Eucharist for actual sins becomes impossible. In what sense then, if any, can we say the Eucharist is a "propitiatory Offering"? The Council of Trent (Session XXII, Chapter 2) speaks of it as "*vere propitiatorium.*" Our Prayer of Humble Access says of the *Communion* "that our bodies may be made clean by His Body and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood." In the Prayer of Oblation the same thought is closely linked with the Sacrifice: "accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; that by the merits and death of Thy Son Our Lord Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy Whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion." The

[1] Hedley, p. 166.

Sacrifice of our Lord's Death and His Heavenly Offering is alone truly propitiatory. If the only Sacrifice in the Eucharist were that of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" it could at most be a dedicatory Burnt Offering resting upon the Lord's Sin Offering. But there is no offering of ourselves apart from Him and His Offering; and in this way the Eucharist is bound up with Calvary and the Heavenly High Priest's work, and we may therefore, without any separation of the two, and consequently without any disparagement of the Cross, look upon the Eucharistic Offering as "propitiatory." It is, of course, in no sense our share in it which makes it such, but only the fact that it enters into and belongs to the One Offering. By it we have "communion with the Atonement." [1]

. . . . .

Our vision of the One Sacrifice now lies spread before us. At its root is the Eternal Divine Love of the Son to the Father before the foundation of the world. By the Incarnation that Love sought and found its expression in the dedicated will of Man to God. "Lo, I come to do Thy Will." Worked out under the conditions brought into the world by Sin, the fulfilment of this obedience involved for the Sinless Son of Man the necessity of Sacrifice, Suffering, and Death. This was completed on Calvary. There the Offerer accomplished the perfect offering of Himself by laying down His Life in Death, by shedding His Blood. Then that Life rose again from Death, and the Priest in the Heavenly Temple offers it upon the

[1] See R. C. Moberly, "Journal of Theological Studies," April, 1901.

Heavenly Altar and "makes atonement" for the sins of men. But also, He Who already as Victim and as Offerer and as Priest represents the redeemed mankind, draws His Church into still closer Union with Himself by the Sacrament of His Body and His Blood, so that She dwelling in Him and He in Her may grow up into the fullness of His Manhood and form His congregation in the Heavenly Temple to offer Him and Herself in Him to God. The Life and Death of Jesus, His Heavenly Offering and its earthly parallel the Eucharistic Offering of Him and of ourselves, mankind and man's High Priest made one in all this—there the long history of Sacrifice all over the world and all down the ages is brought to its climax and perfection. Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past tracing out . . . To Him be the glory for ever. Amen.

INDEX

(*See also Index of Contents*)

Aaronic Priesthood (of our Lord), 148ff.
Altar of Incense, 31, 115
(the Heavenly), 166.
Amos *v. 21–25*, 5
Anamnesis, 129, 163f.
Ara Crucis, 146, 166
arak, 77
Asam, 44
Atonement, 33, 115
and cleansing, 94
Augustine, St., 158, 169
Azazel, 95f.
azkarah, 26f., 29, 163

Blood :
as food, 14, 39, 69, 124, 164
meaning of, 68f., 108
of Jesus, 144ff.
use of, 67ff., 109
Burning, symbolism of, 80

Chrysostom, St., 6
Cleansing by blood, 70
Commensality, 20, 38, 69
Communion theory of Sacrifice, 13
Comparative Religion, 6, 54
Consecration, 39, 49f., 65
by blood, 71
1 Cor. *x. 14–21*, 167 ; *xv. 17*, 145
Corban, 15, 23
Covenant Sacrifice, 14, 26, 39 73f.
and the Day of Atonement, 73, 84

Day of Atonement, 71
Death essential to Sacrifice, 116f., 141–143
"Do this," meaning of, 163
Drink Offerings, 28f.

Enoch, Book of, 98
Exodus *xxiv. 1–11*, 14, 162
Ezekiel, legislation of, 10, 45 47, 77, 83

Fat, as food, 79
Fire, symbolism of, 80
Fire-Offering, 81
Freewill Offering, 37

Gift theory of Sacrifice, 12f. 16ff.
Gregory Nazianzen, St., 173

Heathen Sacrifices, 12, 19, 69, 120
Heave-thigh, 37
Hebrews, Epistle to the, *i. 3*, 155 ; *v. 1–10*, 150, 153 ; *vi. 20*, 150 ; *vii. 11–14*, 148 ; *vii. 25*, 156 ; *vii. 27*, 155 ; *viii. 1–3*, 150 ; *ix.*, 133, 151ff. ; *ix. 13*, 14 ; *ix. 19–21*, 73 ; *ix. 22*, 141 ; *ix. 24*, 152, 156 ; *ix. 25*, 152 ; *x. 5–10*, 133 ; *x. 6*, 126 ; *x. 12–14*, 155 ; *x. 22*, 14 ; *x. 19–25*, 159 ; *xii. 24*, 14, 68 ; *xiii. 10*, 78 ; *xiii. 10–16*, 158, 159, 165
High Place, 75
higrib, 62, 114
higtir, 79
Horns of Altar, 75f.
human sacrifice, 17, 138

Incense, 26f., 31, 89
Inspiration of the Law, 3f.
Intercession and Offering, 153

Irenæus, St., 166
Isaiah *i. 11, 5*; *ii. 2–4, 5*; *liii.*, 120; *liii. 10*, 46.

Jeremiah *vi. 20, 5*; *vii. 21–22, 5*; *xvii. 36, 5*; *xxxi. 14, 5*
Jesus Christ: attitude to the Sacrifices, 6f.
John, St., *vi.*, 14; *x. 17, 18*, 137f.
Josephus, 93
Justification by faith, 168f.

kalil, 42
kipper, 91, 100ff.

Leviticus *xvii. 11, 3*, 108f.

Maimonides, 107
Melchizedekian Priesthood, 139, 147, 150
Mercy Seat (*kapporeth*), 76, 87, 91f.
Micah *iv. 1–3, 5*; *vi. 6–8, 5*
minḥah, 15, 23ff.
Mishna, 93, 98
mizbeaḥ, 66f., 77

New Covenant 162

Odour of a sweet smell, 80f., 124
Offerer, importance of, 61, 137, 149
Offering, cleansing, and consecration, 113
olah, 42
One Offering, the, 125, 134f., 153f., 168f.
Origen, 166

Passover, 40, 161
Philippians, *ii. 8*, 137
Philo, 18, 21f.
poena vicaria, theory of, 104ff.
" pouring " (of the blood), 70, 72
Priesthood of our Lord, 139, 145ff.
Prophets and the Sacrifices, 4–6, 48
Psalm *xl.*, 3, 5, 6, 18; *l.*, 3, 5, 18; *li.*, 5; *cxviii. 27*, 66
" Putting " (of the blood), 74

qetoreth, 79

Revelation *i. 5*, 14; *v. 6*, 152, 156; *vii. 14*, 14
Romans *xii. 1*, 42

Sacrifice:
and Offering, 2, 154f.
definition of, 2
of praise and thanksgiving, 37, 168
within the Godhead, 134
Salt, symbolism of, 25f.
samaḥ, 62
1 Samuel *xvi. 2*, 5
2 Samuel *xxiv. 24*, 21
saraph, 80, 82
Scapegoat, 63f., 95–98, 105
shaḥat, 64
Shechinah, 76, 87, 91f., 152
" Shedding " of blood, 162
Shelamim, 35ff.
Shewbread, 30
Sin, idea of, in the Law, 56f.
" Sprinkling " of blood, 70, 72, 74, 86, 89ff., 110

Table of the Lord, 71, 78, 167
of Shewbread, 67, 78
Thank-Offering, 37
Trent, Council of, 174

Union with Christ, 133ff.

Vicariousness in Sacrifice, 118ff., 131ff., 139ff.
Votive Offering, 37

Wave-breast, 37

zaraq, 72
zebaḥ, 23, 32ff., 64

Printed in Great Britain by
Butler & Tanner Ltd.,
Frome and London

46620
RR86
G255

DATE DUE

SE 12 '83			
[illegible] 18 [illegible]			
NOV 16 1992			
DE 1 '97			
DEC 3 '08			
MAY 15 2012			
JUN 26 2012			
JUN 20 2013			
JUN 10 2014			
APR 07 2015			
JUL 27 2015			

DEMCO 38-297